

# SCISME

Unmask't :

O R,

A late Conference betwixt Mr. *Peter Gunning* and Mr. *John Pierson* Ministers, on the one part, and two Disputants of the Roman Profession on the other : wherein is defined, both *what Schisme is*, and to whom it belongs.

W I T H

A briefe *Recapitulation* ; wherein at one view may be seen the whole drift of this Conference ; for such as want either *Learning* to reach, or *Leisure* to read the whole Tract.

A N D

All is concluded with a Decision of the Main Question, Whether Protestants, or those of the Roman Church be Schismaticks.

A L S O

An *Index* is drawne, pointing at the principall Matters.

---

St. Hierom. in 3. cap. ad Titum.

*Nullum Schisma non sibi aliquam confingit Hæresim, ut rectè ab Ecclesiâ recessisse videatur.*

All Schisme feignes to it selfe some Heresie, that it may seeme to have departed justly from the Church.

---

Printed at *Paris*, Cum Privilegio,

1 6 5 8.



2 C 1 3

Chimney

Given by the ...  
the ...  
...

A ...  
...

All ...  
...

A ...  
...

...

...

10 2 3

# *The Preface of the Catho- lique Disputants.*

*Containing the Proceedings of both  
Parties in matter of Fact.*

**I**N conformity to the desires of some noble Friends, a private Conference was begun betwixt the persons mentioned in the Title, in the Moneth of May, 1657. a little before Whitsontide: The Question to be discussed, as being the Point then, and now, in hottest agitation, and of main concern, was this, *Whether those of the Roman Church, or those of the English Protestant Church be Schismatiques.* Articles were agreed upon on both sides; but because they were neither signed, nor read before the Auditors, (at Mr. *Gunnings* request) but onely a mutual Promise passed to observe them; and because most of them fell not into practice, by reason that we never came to a strict Syllogisticall Dispute, (which was chiefly aimed at in those Articles) we will not insert them into this Preface. These onely are to be mentioned, *viz.* that the

*The Preface.*

Disputants being present, the whole Conference was to be in writing, to prevent all passion in the Disputants; to avoid all doubtfulness in what was answered, or replied; and to remove all tergiversation from what was once asserted: no Persons present in the Conference were to interrupt the Dispute by speaking; no, not the Disputants themselves, without consent on both parts; but the Arguments were to be read by a third Person before the Auditory, and then given to the adverse Party to answer; and after every reading, the Papers were to be signed by both Parties.

This Conference, in the first entrance, was intended to be the work of no more then one day; and might in one have been concluded, had the Disputants fallen to a Syllogisticall Dispute upon the Question it self, at their first meeting. But the Protestant Disputants interposing another indirect difficulty, as a disposall to the main Question (and that out of form) about the *Definition of Schisme*; which the Romane Defendants supposed at first (being a matter so well known) might in few lines have been dispatched;  
and

### *The Preface.*

and by reason of a new Definition of Schisme delivered by the Protestants, and their eager defense of it, and their refusing to returne presently to the direct Question, when it was offered them by their Adversaries, who sent them their first Syllogisme of the main Question in writing the first day, (as appears in the Conference) it grew to so large an extent, that neither a few lines, nor dayes, nor weeks, nor moneths could bring it to a period.

When therefore they were engaged in this loose and diffused way of arguing, after the two first dayes meeting, the Disputants (being hindered by their respective occasions) sealed up the Papers; and by mutuall consent deferred the next meeting till after Whitsonide: when being again assembled, they accorded to give Coppies each to other of their severall Readings, the same day that they read their Papers before the Auditory; and to appoint each day they met; the time of their next meeting, to the end they might compose their Answers and Replies in absence; and at the day designed read them in each others presence before four

### *The Preface.*

or five Persons of worth and learning, of either part, who might witnesse what passed in those meetings.

The Conference thus digested was carried on fairly and orderly for many meetings, there being a pronenesse on both sides, to render a mutual satisfaction; and all occurring difficulties and misunderstandings were easily composed. But the Conference arriving to a large extent, and no means being found to restrain, or finish it, though many were proposed; and both Parties professed a strong desire to bring it to a speedy issue; it was at last concluded, as followeth.

July 7<sup>th</sup>. 1657.

1. *To those Papers this day given in about the Formalis ratio, and to those to come about Firmilian from the other party, we of the Church of England will returne one Answer, to which we will permit them to give us afterwards a final Answer without our Reply.*

2. *To those Papers which are given in unto us, of Authorities, we will Reply, by bringing in ours and answering theirs; to which our Reply we will expect their Answer, and afterwards return our finall Reply,*

## The Preface.

ply, without any more Papers from them to follow in that particular.

3. Within some little time after this, we will dispute this matter about the Definitions in two dayes, by strict Syllogismes, or more, as both sides shall agree; and within some little time after this, we will dispute the Question it self, whether party are guilty of Schisme, by strict Syllogismes written, and so the Answers.

4. In conclusion of all, each may write a Recapitulation of the Sum and State of the Disputation taken out of their own Papers respectively.

This Agreement was signed by  
both parties.

The next meeting, (as was before agreed) was to be the *Tuesday* three weeks after the *Tuesday* next following our former meeting, which was done accordingly. In this meeting were read the Papers of the Roman Defendants in answer to the instance of *Firnilian*: which being ended, Mr. *Gunning* entreated the said Defendants before the Auditory, to lend him for two or three dayes the fair Copy of the Protestants Papers, to which the Catholics answered that day, that he  
might

### *The Preface.*

might get them writ out for his own use. Those were delivered to him, and being required back some eight or ten dayes after, he excused the return of them, because (as he alledged) he could not finde a Scribe to write them over. Which from time to time being often demanded of Mr. *Gunning*, he still retained, upon pretense of the former excuse, of not being able to get a scribe, till *January 4<sup>th</sup>. 1657.* as his letter of that Date testifies, with which he sent them; that is about five moneths after they were lent him, when he onely borrowed them (as we said) for three or four dayes.

The Catholique Defendants having thus given in a compleat Answer to all the Papers of their Adversaries, and they being indebted to the Catholiques a whole Reply to that Answer, they began to read the first part of their Reply the next week; but they gave then no Copy of that Reading to the Catholique party, (as it had been agreed) yet promising to give it in speedily, it was born withall; and one of the Roman Disputants, who lived far from the City, propounded to the others, and to the Auditory, that

Winter

### *The Preface.*

Winter coming on, and his health not able to endure many Winter Journeys, he might have the favor to be excused from being present at *their* Readings, appointing one there present for his Deputy in time of his absence. This equal request was granted; and accordingly the next reading was performed: but because, (though the designed Deputy was there) yet by reason that the other Disputant of the Catholique Party was hindered (contrary to his full intention) by an unexpected occasion, and the Deputy would not resolve some doubt about explication of words, which the Protestant Party demanded of him, alledging that he had no power given him to do any more then be present at the Reading, and receive the Papers read. Mr. *Gunning* took occasion upon this pretense to revoke his former concession, and absolutely to require the presence of the said absent Disputant, resolving to read no more without him; alledging for his reason, that his friends perswaded him, not to proceed otherwise: And when he was minded by a letter, of his promise, he answered that he was induced to promise it much against  
his



### *The Preface.*

his will by the motion of that Disputant; to which it was replied, there was no cause given him to do any thing against his will, when there was no force used, but a reasonable request propounded, and presently as such reputed, and granted without any demonstration of difficulty (all things considered) either by him or those of his Party in the Auditory. And the resolution of their doubt propounded to the Deputy in time of that reading, might easily have been cleared by a few lines from Mr. *Gun.* to the other Catholique Disputant, who was in Town. These things to have passed in this manner betwixt us, is manifest from our mutuall Letters sent and received, from *September* to *December*; which we are ready to shew to any one, who shall desire the perusall of them for their satisfaction.

Though therefore we might in rigour have kept him to his promise, yet to avoid all difficulties, and put a speedy dispatch to the main business, the absent Disputant was content to yield, and make a Winter Journey of some dayes, to afford his presence at the Conference: but with this *Proviso*, that their whole Answer to  
all

### *The Preface.*

all the Papers which they had of ours unanswered (which were three parts of four) of the whole Conference, and all fair written out, should be ready to be delivered unto us the same dayes the readings were held; and that the appointing the time and place of reading, should be in the power of the Romane Disputants for their security. To all which Mr. *Gunning* in his Letter, dated *December* the third, to the Disputant who was in the countrey, answers in these words. *Be you, I pray you present, see if I ever complain of your Assistants absence. Appoint your place as private as you will; your number as you will; your time when you will, after a week, &c.* To this Letter was answered, that the said Disputant would be present at Christmas; which gave Mr. *Gunning* a fortnights more time then he required. He came to Town accordingly upon New-Years day: and the second of *January* writ to Mr. *Gunning*, in the words following.

S I R, I certifie you by these, that I am in readiness, according to my promise, to go forward with the Conference, and to hear your long expected Answer, and to agree about

## The Preface.

about time, place, and other circumstances; provided that you send us presently the Papers which you borrowed of me four moneths ago, and whereof you have a Coppy of your own writing in your hands; and that the other Papers which you have read, be delivered into our hands the first day of our meeting, (if not before) which we much desire, signed by you, before you read any more; and that you oblige your self under your hand to have the full answer to all our Papers not yet answered by you, as well to the proof of the Definition, as to the Formal reason, Firmilian, &c.) and kept in your hands, ready to be read, as we shall appoint the dayes, before any reading be expected from us. To this I desire your answer by this Bearer, and shall proceed accordingly. Concerning other matters we shall have more occasion to treat very suddenly. I rest, &c. January 2. 1657.

To which he answered the fourth of January, 1657. as followeth.

S I R, At ten a clock on Saturday I received a Letter from you. I send you the Papers which were borrowed of you. What you mean by all the conditions you impose upon me, before (as you say) I be admitted to read

## The Preface.

read any more, I understand not; nor whence is that Authority of admitting me, or not admitting me, as you please; and of conditions so decretorily prescribed me by you, before debate, whether they be reasonable or no.

If you please to let me know, where I may speak with you, of that you call my being admitted, or not admitted to read any more: that I may know to understand you, and you me, I shall agree with you about the time, and place, and other circumstances of our Reading; which I hope will tend more toward the issue of the Controversie depending, then this way of prescription from one to the other. I shall not fail to satisfy what is reasonable to be desired; and to that I am in readiness (as I have been long since) and still remain, Sir, your very humble servant. P. Gunning

And by way of Postscript on the other Leaf of his Letter, thus. Sir, The other Page I wrote unto you on Saturday night, the hour when I received your Letter; but knew not how to send to you, where you were.

I desire to speake with you (now that the Twelfth-day is so near) on Thursday morning, when I will either come my self alone where you appoint me; or if you please to come to my lodging, I will be within, that we may better agree upon all conditions.

## The Preface.

My Propositions (I suppose so reasonable) are these.

First, That we meet to read every other Wednesday, till our Controversie be finished.

2. That when my Readings have finished an Answer to the Papers you gave us at once and together, then you receive from us, all transcribed and signed by us together, our Answer to yours delivered to us together (if first signed by you, which yet they are not.)

Jan. 4th.

Your friend and servant,

1657.

Peter Gunning.

Whereto the other rendred this Answer, the 6th. of January following.

Sir, Your long delay in answering our Papers, which you have held, some above three moneths, others above half a year in your hands, inforced me, to minde you of the Conditions agreed upon in the beginning of this Conference, (not to proscribe you any new ones, as you seem to conceive) which were to deliver the Papers on both sides, presently upon the reading of them, to the other Party, to be answered by them; and which we both observed in the beginning, and we for our parts ever since: and you upon pretense of not being able to finde in the whole Extent of London a Scribe to write some few sheets of paper, deferred to send us your  
Answer

## The Preface.

*Anſwer read, for many weeks, and no ſmall number of moneths. Marvell not therefore, nor have you reaſon to take it in ill part, if we exact of you both what we have alwayes done to you, and both did in the beginning, and each party agreed to, as fit to be done. Nor need you formalize upon my mentioning your non-admittance to proceed in reading more, till theſe conditions be compleated. For I intended not thereby to aſſume any Authority to my ſelf, of either admitting or not admitting you, but preſumed that the Auditory on both ſides would be ſo juſt, as to ſee equality and conditions obſerved betwixt us, ere they admit either of us to proceed. Seeing therefore we have perpetually, according to conditions, given a compleat anſwer to all your Papers, and let you have preſently upon reading a full Coppy of our Anſwers, I doubted nothing of the Auditories Verdict, of exacting an Obligation from you in writing, of doing the like to us, ere your reading proceed further.*

*What you ſay in the ſecond page of your laſt, ſtrikes me into a wonder, that after I had told you in a late one of mine, that I neither had means to ſtay long from home, nor health, to make many long Winter Journeys: You require, that Readings may be*

## The Preface.

held every other Wednesday, till the Controversie be ended; and that not to be done, (as you signified before) without I be present. Truly Sir, you seem to think of nothing but your own conveniences, and have no regard to those of your friends: For by this means you for your part, after you have had a halfe years time to prepare an Answer to some of our papers, and three or four moneths for the rest, you yet demand a fortnights respite for every reading of yours, and would oblige us upon a fortnights warning to begin the reading of our Answer, (after yours in part onely is read) and so to continue till it be ended. Can you possibly think, or any rational man, that there is any equality in this? And yet I wonder more to see you here require determinately so many fortnights, when in your Letter to me, Decem. the 3<sup>d</sup>. you left it wholly to my determination, to appoint the time, (when I will.) Our desire therefore is, that seeing you are yet so unready with your Answer, after so long a time to prepare it, that you require still so many fortnights more to absolve it, that you would determine how much time you will require to compleat the whole Answer to the proofs of the Definition, Formall Reason, Firmilian, and all that you have in your hands,



### *The Preface.*

*hands; and I will not fail, (God willing) to be present, when you let me understand, that all is ready, that in a short time all may be read. Sir, These things I beseech you to consider, and to morrow betwixt eight and nine of the clock, I will either come with my fellow Disputant, or some one of my friends to your lodging, or desire your presence in another, not far from you, with Mr. Peirson, or Mr. Oly, if you please, but no other. Sir, Yours, &c.*

*Jan. 6<sup>th</sup>. 1657.*

*These Letters thus sent, and received, upon the day appointed we met, and agreed before some worthy friends upon what was mentioned in the said Disputants Letter of the 6<sup>th</sup>. of January, viz. That they should every fortnight prepare as much as would suffice for one reading; and when, according to this proportion of preparing, their whole Answer was ready to all our Papers unanswered, and ready to be given us fair written the same day they read them, they should let that Disputant know it, and he would presently come to Town, and be present at the Conference. Things thus composed, he returns again into the Countrey, and expects to be called by the Opponents within some competent time.*



### *The Preface.*

He remained in the Countrey till the beginning of Lent ; as supposing, that then at least their Answer might be in a readiness. Presently after he arrived, Mr. *Gunning* being acquainted with it by a friend, writ to the other in this manner.

Mr. *Gunnings* Letter of February the 27. 1657.

Sir, A Friend bringing me word, that you are in Town, and desiring me to write unto you. This briefly. I am glad to hear you are well, and shall be glad to see you. As to our business I abide in our last agreement; which was, that either we meet every other Wednesday, if, and when your occasions will permit your stay in Town; or that you expect till I send you word, that I have wholly finished what I will do: which shall be so soon as I can: nor do I forget it, or mean to let it sleep. For beside any allegation of my many other businesses, I have since last I saw you, not equally enjoyed my health, and strength as before, divers wayes; whereby I have had enough to do, to bear up to my publique business. Yet to you, as a Person, on whom lies expectation of some disputation with your Adversaries here, (as you told me, and I believe, and truly desire) I make this friendly motion; that since disputation  
is

## The Preface.

is expected from you and your Adversary, we may have (in the mean while, till this large, lax way of discourses by many sheets of many dayes writing and reading can be finished; which indeed is writing of Books, rather then disputing) a strict, and properly called Disputation; and as you desired by present Syllogismes and Answers, and that by your and my present writing down in short strictly Syllogisme and Answer (and that either with, or without any second, &c. And then names Transubstantiation and sufficiency of sole Scripture to be proved by tradition for his questions.

In this Letter Mr. G. mistakes our last agreement, viz. by omitting the main Point conditioned betwixt us in it, That he had obliged himself to prepare every fortnight as much of his Answer, as would suffice for one whole Reading; and that being done, to send the absent Disputant word, when he was ready.

To which Answer was returned March the first, as followeth.

Mr. Gunning, I received yours of the 27<sup>th</sup>. of February the last night; for which I render you many thanks. As to the main business, which you (most properly) call our business, my desires and resolutions are to per-

## The Preface.

first in that, which you mention, as our last agreement; namely to expect, untill you send me word, that you have wholly finished your Answer to all our Papers, which have remained in your hands since August; and that your Coppies of your Answers be likewise ready to be delivered unto us at the same time that you read your Answers: which I hope will (now at least) be effected within a very short time. This done, it shall clearly appear, that as my friend and I have not, so we will not put any delay to the Work, but hasten to accomplish what was agreed betwixt your self and Mr. Peirson on your part, and our selves on our part. So that this Disputation, which hath so long depended; and hath been so much expected, may come to a more speedy conclusion, and be published for the satisfaction of others.

As to your friendly motion, my Answer is, That untill our present Disputation be ended, and made publique, I am resolved not to engage in any other Question; because I conceive it will be a further hinderance to the prosecution of the business begun, (you having already so little time, as I perceive by your Letter, to bestow upon it) and will likewise be interpreted by others an unwillingness on one side, to bring this fundamental

## The Preface.

damentall Question to an Issue.

And now Sir, give me leave to be free with you without offence. It is very true that I did affirm the world to be in expectation of some Disputation from us. But in this I intended no other, then the expectation they have of our drawing the Question already begun to a speedy conclusion: and which being well ended, will soon make the world see (which is the thing I solely aim at) whether in other points our Church, or your Party be to be followed. This expectation and the effect of it will, I conceive, be frustrated by our neglecting the prosecution of this, to enter upon other Questions, which we must not admit of, lest we therein seem to contradict our selves, who have so long, so solicitously, so frequently urged and pressed you, that you would be willing to hasten to give the world satisfaction; and who have expressed our own zeal to give this satisfaction; by never having been guilty of one culpable delay, or dilating our selves in writing at any time, more then was precisely necessary, as will appear, when what is written on both sides shall be perused by others.

But if you and Mr. Peirson do either for want of time, or for other reasons, which are not to be discovered, disincline to pro-

## The Preface.

ceed further, or to proceed with that speed, as the nature of the work requires in this businesse; I shall beseech you to speak your sense freely, that I may be no longer guilty of urging that upon you, which shall be ungratefull. And if you shall please to intimate this to be your meaning, I shall humbly rest content with what hath already passed betwixt us: And shall not doubt, but even this will in some measure give satisfaction to others when they read it. Thus I rest, &c. March the first, 1658.

To which receiving no answer in some dayes, we joyntly writ another Letter to our Adversaries, pressing them to a speedy and direct Answer: wherein first we made a rehearfall of what had passed, and is already mentioned in the former Letters, telling them that then eight moneths had passed, since they received our last Papers, &c. and then added the words following, viz. Only this we must crave leave to minde you of, that in the beginning of this Conference one of you, namely Mr. Gunning, was pleased to adjudge it reasonable, that although we then had agreed not to publish this present Controversie to the world, but upon joynt consent, yet if either Party were guilty of a culpable neglect,

## The Preface.

lest, or delay, at any time, in the prosecution of the businessse, the other Party should be at liberty to print. Let the world and all just men judge betwixt us, whether Party have been guilty of culpable delays in this Affair. And yet notwithstanding your so many delays and put offs, (which cast the whole guilt upon your heads and your cause) we daily finde, that we are the onely sufferers; your Party continually crying up you as victorious, and decrying us as baffled and worsted; and as not daring to come to an issue in this great Controversie. And this upon no other ground, that we can understand, then for that we have for this many moneths stood still and silent, fearing that we should prejudice your reputation by discovering the matter of fact, according to truth. But since we finde this way very prejudiciall to our just and holy Cause, you must now give us leave to be carefull, that God and his Church suffer no injury. What disgraces or disadvantages soever shall fall upon our own private persons, we can well bear. But when prejudices fall upon the Church of God, which we have power to prevent, we know you will hold us obliged in Duty and Conscience to preserve Truth in honour to the utmost of our power. We  
have

## The Preface.

have therefore thought it necessary to make this our last request unto you ; in which we earnestly desire you, that we may receive all your Answers to all our Papers now remaining with you unanswered, within a fortnight from this day at the furthest : and that in default thereof you will not take it ill, that we proceed for the justification of our Cause, and that truth which we are ready to defend, to let the world know, who they are who have appeared dilatory, and unwilling to come to a full and clear Issue in this business, wherein all men are concerned. If within the time, which we here prefix, you will please to send us, or either of us notice under your hands, that all your Answers are ready to all our Papers yet remaining with you unanswered ; together with Copies of the same to deliver unto us, we shall (according to the just and reasonable power allowed unto us, by your selves for our own securities) appoint the place and time, when and where we will attend the receiving and hearing them. But if you shall still delay, we shall cease from being further importune. We are, &c.

This Letter we put into the hands of a Worthy Friend, to deliver it when he found a fit occasion : who not finding Mr.

Gunning



### *The Preface.*

*Gunning* at home, was constrained to keep it many dayes, and at last delivered it upon Good Friday, and dated it accordingly.

To this Letter, *April 14. 1658.* *Mr. Gun.* writ in answer a Letter of 6. pages in *folio*, and so is too long to be inserted in this small Preface. In this Letter he first complains that it was *given him on Good Friday.* We answer that it had been written many dayes before, as that Worthy Person can testifie, who had it in his hands, and had many times endeavoured to deliver it: the date whereof we left to be inserted by him, because it required a fortnights time after the delivery, to prepare themselves for their full answer. Secondly, he affirms, that the conditions at first were to *write and answer in presence*; and then he, who should be in culpable delay, was to yield a freedom of printing to the other Party. We answer, that this writing in presence was broke off by themselves the second day of meeting; their Authorities coming in so late at night, that there was no time left to answer them, (as the whole Auditory knows:) and after that we had agreed to write in *absence*, and read in presence. *Mr. Gunning*



### *The Preface.*

ning repeated this freedom for printing before the Auditory. Thirdly, that by writing in absence, we might have *fourty* to help us against them two. Answer. May not we say the same of them? Who had more to help them, and greater freedom to have recourse to others, we or they, let the world judge: and what help we had from others, Persons of worth know, and can testifie. Fourthly, *That the Readings grew to be of many hours.* Answer. Who occasioned this by diverting the question, and proceeding out of form, but they? As appears above, and page 1, 2. of this Treatise. Fifthly, *In one Reading neither of the Romane Disputants appeared.* Answer. One appeared by his substitute, who was before accepted to supply his place by them; and the other was accidentally hindered against his intention. Sixthly, *They agreed not to meet and read at Christmas.* Answer. Mr. Gunning promised to be ready a fortnight before Christmas, as appears by his Letter of Decem. 3<sup>d</sup> above cited: and his Adversary writ, that at Christmas he would be there to attend on him. Seventhly, *That they had many other and more principall matters in hand, then this was.* Answer. And why should they

*The Preface.*

they think, that we had not also? or how knew they we had not as much as they? Those who know our affairs can witness, that many other important controversies passed under our hands at that very time; yet neither of us were to put a stay to this, by reason of them; because none were so publickly known and expected to be finished as this. Eighthly, He excuses his not dispatching in so many moneths time his Answer to our Papers which he had not answered; because, saith he, a whole volume will be required to answer *about the Authority of the Fourth Lateran Council, and the opposition of the Greek Church* against them. Answer. These two points could not hinder the speedy dispatch of what he had to answer; for he had long before this given his last answer (according to our former agreement) to them both, as appears in this Treatise, from p. 352. to p. 367. and from p. 605. to p. 612. where they are fully handled. Ninthly, He objects our refusall of a Dispute in form upon some other Questions. Answer. Why propounded he not to have one of *this of Schisme*? Why this intermitted to go to others? Who would not have condemned us both of levity and backwardnesse

*The Preface.*

wardness to proceed in our Question begun? the dispatch whereof was so much expected by both Parties. Tenthly. But, sayes he, it would onely have taken up two dayes, being in form. Answer. A likely matter, that four main Questions, one of Transubstantiation; the other of the Ancient universall tradition about the Sufficiency of sole Scripture appointed by him; and two others correspondent to these to be nominated by us, could be dispatched in two dayes, unlesse we had made more haste then good speed. Sees he not, that in his two Questions (and the same might have been of ours) the Arguments must be brought to Authorities? and those must be sought in Books, compared with other Authours and places? &c. and to dispatch, to any mans satisfaction such four Questions in two dayes, to us is a Paradox. But suppose they might have been brought to an Issue in two dayes, what certainty was there, that they would be? Does he not confesse in this his Letter, that our present Question was intended to have been in form, and decided in one day? And yet it happened to be of many moneths. Why might not Syllogisticall form have been prevented in these,

### *The Preface.*

these, as well as in this? And so once engaged in the others, we must have bidden *Farewell* to this, till they were concluded, as being then in hand; and before that, some new ones might have been propounded, the old ones being grown large, and so we should have made an end of nothing.

These be the chief materiall Heads of his long letter, (as will appear to any one who will take the pains to read it) to which we hope to have given satisfaction.

In our former Letter, to which this was an answer, we mentioned some sinister Reports, which by reason of this long delay in proceeding in the Conference, were credibly testified to be given out against us, by some of our Adversaries friends, concerning which we writ to Mr. Gunning, and he cleared us from them, and himself from the knowledge of them, in his Letter dated December 3. 1657. saying, *I deny that ever it came from me, or my assistant, or from any that had it from us, or either of us, any word of all that in the beginning of your Letter, viz. That we are so victorious against you; that we cannot get any Papers from you, nor prevail with you to proceed; or that your assistant and you are worsted: never a syllable*

## The Preface.

syllable of this came ever out of my mouth to friend or foe, nor ever did it come to my ears, your Letter being the first, yea, onely reporter of any such sense that I ever heard of. Thus Mr. G. Yet those reports grew on and encreased so far, that it was commonly bruited and believed by Protestants, that our unreadiness and backwardness in answering, was the sole cause that this Conference was not brought to an issue. Seeing therefore, there was no hopes to arrive to a quick dispatch by this manner of Mr. Gunning's answering our Letters, we importuned him again, so far, that if within a fortnight he were not ready, as before mentioned, we were resolved to publish what had been already done: and he again professed to have a Reading every Fortnight, upon a very false report, that the said Disputant had his abode in Town; when he was at that very time ready to return into the Countrey: and as he came up, so he remained, onely in order to an accomplishing of this Business. This Letter of his was dated June 15<sup>th</sup>. 1658. which was six months almost after Christ-masse, and above three quarters of a year after he had the remainder of our Papers in his hands (some small number of sheets) to answer.

Yet

### *The Preface.*

Yet being desirous to give them and the world all possible satisfaction, upon the receipt of this Letter, we presently returned an Answer, that we were content to give him one meeting, and to hear one Reading of theirs; and in that to treat further with him about what should be done: provided that the meeting might be upon Tuesday of the next week following that our Answer. But when our Letter was carried to his lodging, he was gone into the Countrey, and returned not for the space of about a fortnight: so that our hopes were frustrated either of meeting, or of receiving any Answer in time, of our Letter; which made us to apply our selves to order matters for the publishing of what we had of the Conference. But whilest we were reviewing the Papers, we perceived, that some part of *their* Papers (where to we had answered, and had inserted most of their Reply into our Answer) were wanting; as having been lost in transporting them from one place to another, both in the Countrey and here. This we signified in a Letter of June 2. 1658. desiring, that those Papers might, with Mr. *Gunnings* license, be written out of his Copies, at our trouble and charges,

*The Preface.*

charges, and promising faithfully to return them within three or four dayes, to which he rendred a negative answer *June 15<sup>th</sup>*. We after this reiterated our request, and desired, that our mutuall Papers might be signed when we met. And after that in a third Letter of *June 26<sup>th</sup>*. we required of him some other Papers of theirs, which so far as could be gathered from our mutual Letters of *Jan. 2. Jan. 4. and Jan. 11. 1657.* were never sent us from them.

These three Letters were delivered to a noble friend of ours, who was many times at Mr. *Gunnings* lodgings: and when he could not finde him at home to deliver them to him, after he had kept them above a moneth in his hands, resigned them to a friend of his to get an occasion to deliver them, he himself being then to go into the Countrey. But since that time the Roman Disputants have neither understood of any answer to those Letters, nor of the delivery of them. In the mean time, that Disputant, who had in vaine expected all this while, from *Lent* till *July*, was forced to retire; and being not able any longer to afford his presence, transported his Papers, and committed them to the Print.

The



*The Preface.*

This is the reality of our proceedings in the whole carriage of this business, as may be undeniably proved, either by our Authentick Letters, and Agreements in writing, or by the Testimony of Persons of that worth and integrity, that they cannot be suspected of any indirect, or unfaithfull dealing.

Whatsoever therefore of their Papers is not actually inserted into this Treatise, is by reason, that they either refused to send us a Copy of them, as we had agreed mutually to do one to the other, or because they would not let us have what by accident was lost. Yet we hope, that as we have punctually answered to that part of those which miscarried, so have we also answered to the substance of those few which we never received; and if they can shew any thing materiall in them, which in this Treatise ha's not received satisfaction, we here oblige our selves to give full satisfaction to it.

Some may haply make a particular reflection upon our expressing the Names of our Adversaries, and not our own; but we hope the difference of theirs and our condition will plead our excuse in this to all rationall Persons.

As



### *The Preface.*

As to our mutual Replies and Answers read before the Auditory, and whereof we sent Copies the one to the other, we here make a solemn Protestation, that we have not willingly either added, or altered, or omitted one word in all that is here printed; and refer our selves most willingly to the triall of our respective Papers, as to this, if any please to require it of us. True it is, considering that the large Extent of the most part of our reciprocal Replies and Answers, as they stand in the authentick Papers, contain very different difficulties, and heads within them; and the Answers commonly are many pages distant from their respective Replies. We found it necessary to make some change in the Method, to avoid confusion, and procure clarity; by reducing matters of the same nature together, and dividing them into their severall Chapters, Sections, or Paragraphs, as we saw occasion, intending onely thereby to make so clear distinctions in every particular, as might take away all obscurity in matters so speculative and Metaphysical, as many are in this Treatise: prefixing Titles to the Chapters, Sections, &c. and giving the like liberty to them upon the  
the

### *The Preface.*

the like occasion; which we endeavour to illustrate, partly in our last *Recapitulation*, and partly in our *Index*: referring all to the equall Censure of every Christian Reader.

---

### *Some Observations for the Reading of this Treatise.*

1. **T**hat the Figures which are cited of the *Pages* or *Fol.* are referred to the Papers written, not to the Print; save some toward the end, which have the word *Print*, added to them; and those of the *Recapitulation* and *Index*, which are referred to the Print.

2. That many times Sections, and Answers or Replies, begin with References to what went before them; which are in regard of the *Authenticall Papers*, which we would not alter.

3. That some References are made of Things precedent or consequent in diverse places, which have respect onely to the written Papers; and are often noted with this mark \*

4. That

## The Preface.

4. That the last Reply and Answer to it, belonging to the first Section, about the word *Voluntary*, pag. 11. is to be found pag. 584. continued to pag. 587. And their last Reply and our Answer, about the Notion of Schisme, pag. 261. is to be found pag. 614. continued to pag. 624.

**Schisme**

# *Schisme defined, &c.*

The Question.

*whether those of the Roman Church,  
or those of the English Protestant  
Church be Schismaticques?*

The first Chapter.

*Containing the Proposition of the Que-  
stion controverted; and the first  
Argument of the Protestant oppo-  
nents, for the disproof of the Defini-  
tion of the Catholique Defendants.*

## SECT. I.

Protestants, I.

**T**He Church of England and those  
that abide in her Obedience are  
not Schismaticall: But those  
commonly known under the notion  
of the Papacy, or Papists, in the Church of  
Rome, which condemn the Church of Eng-  
land, and adhere to the Councils of Lateran  
and Trent, are Schismaticall.

B

The

## The definition of Schism

*Catholiques 1.*

The Question thus stated is accepted.

P. 2.

*Being to dispute of Schisme, is it not meet, that you and we briefly define what is Schisme.*

C. 2.

Yes. Schisme is a voluntary separation of one part from the whole true visible Church of Christ.

P. 3.

*Your Definition given we admit to be true, as a Proposition; we think it may be thus more explicately defined.*

*Schisme is any voluntary renting, or separating our selves; or without sufficient authority and sufficient cause, separating, or thrusting others, (which lies in us) or also a causing, following, or allowing any such aforementioned separation, from the unity and communion of the one Body of Christ, or of any true part of that Body, in that which every part ought to supply towards other of communion, whether of Coordination or Subordination respectively.*

C. 3.

If you admit our Definition, we will proceed upon it: and when you come  
to

*propounded and explicated.*

3

to dispute, if you can make your Explication good, you may proceed upon it.

P. 4.

*We did not yield, nor admit your Definition, as a true convertible Definition; and when we propounded another more explicate Definition, you call it onely an Explication of a Definition, which is another thing. We now shew, why yours is not a Definition, nor true Description; for we would not be nice with you.*

*The Pastour that voluntary separates one of his Flock by just Excommunication, is confessedly not Schismaticall; and yet it is a voluntary Separation of one part from the whole true visible Church of Christ: Ergo, yours is not a Definition, as taking no notice of thrusting another out of Communion justly or unjustly.*

C. 4.

*In our Definition of Schisme, Separation is taken for separation of ones self actively, and not a separation of another by Excommunication, whereby another is separated passively: this appears by the word voluntary.*

P. 5.

*And the word voluntary helps not your*  
B 2 *Defini-*

*Definition to be perfect : because separation of another actively may be as voluntary, as the separation of ones self actively.*

## C. 5

The word *voluntary* is a necessary ingredient in our definition of Schisme : for he, who separates another by Excommunication from the Church remains united to the whole Church, and so cannot himself be a Schismaticque ; and the party so excommunicated doth not actively separate, but is passively separated.

## P. 6.

*Now to what you say, the word voluntary is a necessary ingredient in your definition of Schisme, you and we were before agreed that that's true ; but you speak not ad oppositum : for we in our last denied the word voluntary to be able to help your definition to be perfect ; the perfection of your definition being now made the question : And now you reply, that the word voluntary is necessary to enter your definition, that was not in question at all, but whether the word voluntary helped your definition to be perfect. A thing may be necessary, which yet without something else is no way sufficient.*

To



## C. 6.

To the Paragraph relating to the word *voluntary*, we say, you answer not our reason; for there we distinguished active and passive separation; the former whereof can onely be Schismatical, because it is *voluntary*, and supposeth the person some way or other divided from the Church; which he who excommunicates cannot be by force onely of excommunicating another. And by the word *voluntary* we intended not the perfection of the definition to consist in it, but to make an essentiall difference betweene active and passive separation.

## P. 7.

In the Paragraph next before your own grounds of your definition, about the word *voluntary*, you say, we answer not to your reason: For there, say you, you distinguished Active and Passive Separation; the former whereof can onely be Schismaticall, because it is *voluntary*, and supposes the person some way or other divided from the Church, which he that excommunicates cannot be by force onely of Excommunication. To all this we have already spoken most plainly, That we as well as you, (and

therefore this is nothing against us) distinguished 'twixt voluntary active separation, and involuntary passive, being separated; and imputed Schisme onely to the former in our definition, and in all our replies. But then we told you, that in unjust thrusting others out of the Church, and that for keeping due Catholique Communion, the unjust active separatour of others is as active and voluntary surely altogether, as he that separates himself: Active to anothers injury, and the more injurious, because the separated person is involuntary, and grieved by his pleasure. We wonder now to read you, saying, That active separation supposeth the person some way or other divided from the Church: whereas indeed the active separatour of himself is not supposed, but first becomes divided by that act of separating; and the active unjust separatour of others, (if for keeping due Catholique Communion) thereby divides himself also.

We never said or thought, that he who excommunicates, can be a Schismaticque by force onely of excommunicating another: yea, our first Assertion and Argument it was, about the beginning of this Conference, That the Bishop that voluntarily separates

of his flock by just Excommunication, is confessedly not schismaticall: whence we proved your Definition not to be just.

C. 7.

To what you say, that you proved our Definition not to be just, because a just Excommunication may be a *voluntary* separation of one part from the whole true visible Church of Christ, and yet the just Excommunicator is no Schismaticque, &c, We answer, that according to the rules of Logickall Disputes, it is in the power of the Definer to limit his words to that sense, whereof they are connaturally capable; which he professes to be the sense he intended, and in which they are usually and familiarly taken by approved Authors, in the like definitions. Now who can doubt, but these words, *A separation of one part, &c.* are connaturally capable to signifie, that that part makes a separation of it self from the Church, for that separation thus made of himself, is most properly *the separation of one part from the Church*. Secondly, that this, and this only, was our meaning by those words, we have made sufficient protestation. Thirdly, that separation is usually taken amongst

approved Authours, in this definition, for an active separation of themselves, being before parts of the Church, we shall make most manifest, in the copious alledging Authorities for our definition in the end of this present rejoinder. Doctor *Hammonds* Authority cited here by us may now suffice, where he defines Schisme according to the usuall sense of the Fathers, *A separation, or receding of any member from the unity of the body, &c.* Where separating, or separation, is taken for a recession, or receding; that is, a dividing ones self from the Church. Though therefore the word *Separation* may be extended to some other signification, wholly unusual in the definition of Schism, amongst Classick Authors, yet that hinders not the fulnesse and propriety of our definition; seeing it is most properly and usually taken in the sense wherein we take it, consonant unto the propriety of the words, and intended by us.

To what you say, That the active separatour of himself is not supposed, but first becomes divided by that act of separating, &c. We answer, that the act of separating ones self, considered  
onely

onely under the notion of an Ingredient into the Definition of Schisme, as there we consider it, supposes, as you acknowledge, that the person separating must be divided some way or other from the Church, which is not done by every active separation of another from the Church, as we here say, and you presently grant: which hinders not the actuall dividing of the separatour of himself from the Church, to be formally effected by that active separation of himself, as considered according to its specificall and peculiar notion.

P. 8.

*To your fourth Argument we answer first, That we first denied the convertibility of your definition upon this ground, That all to whom the definition doth agree, are not contained under the thing defined: and we gave this instance, The Bishop that voluntary separates one of his flock by just Excommunication, is confessedly not Schismaticall: and consequently is not contained under the Definitum; and yet it is a voluntary separation of one part from the whole true visible Church,*

and consequently your definition belongeth to him. Now whatsoever definition belongeth to any, not contained under the Definitum, that definition is not convertible. To this you answered, That in your definition, separation was taken for separation of ones self actively, not the separation of another; which no man can collect out of the words of your definition.

But you said, this appeared by the word voluntary. To which we answered clearly, that it did not appear by the word voluntarily; and we gave this reason, because separation of another actively may be as voluntary, as the separation of ones self actively. Now if the word voluntary may agree as well and truly to the active separation of another as of ones self, then it could not appear by the word voluntary, that separation of ones self onely is contained in your definition. For how could it possibly exclude that act, to which it as properly belongs, as to that which you would have it to contain? To this reason of ours so plainly propounded, you never gave the least answer, but onely replied, the word voluntary is a necessary ingredient in your definition, which we never denied; who placed it in the front of our defini-

definition, as you had done in yours. But instead of answering our reason, you give a reason, why the word voluntary was necessary: and your reason is, For he who separates another actively, &c. cannot be schismaticall; which is so far from being a reason to maintain your definition, that it is the very reason by which we refuted it. For because a Bishop voluntarily separating a part from the whole true visible Church by a just Excommunication, cannot thereby become a Schismaticque; Therefore your definition doth belong to him, to whom the Definitum doth not belong, and therefore it is not convertible.

C. 8.

To what you say of the word voluntary, we distinguish into two Classes. For voluntary is either taken in opposition to involuntary, or not free, or in opposition to a reasonable and prudent proceeding. In the just Excommunicatour it is taken only in the first acception; but in our definition it is taken in both. For Schisme is not onely a free and willing, but a precipitous, heady, unreasonable, imprudent, and willfull separation of ones self from the visible Church; and so the holy Fathers (cited above.



above \* by us) familiarly expresse it, by *sponte*, of ones own wilfull motion, *suo arbitrio*, by ones own proper will, &c. which cannot be said of a just excommunicator, as all know: for he must proceed according to Reason, Prudence and Equity in such actions; and a Scismaticque can never proceed in that manner: because neither Reason, Equity, nor Prudence, can move any one to separate himself from the whole true visible Church of Christ, as St. *Augustine* affirms, even cited by Dr. *Hammond*, Ep. 48. Again, the word *Separation* in a just Excommunication, is quite of a different nature, from that which is made by Schisme. For the first is onely a semotion, or medicinall sejunction for a time, for the humiliation and conversion of the excommunicated person; and makes not the person justly separating to set up himself as a separated part, and maintain his cause, and corroborate his party against the whole Church, which the separation of Schisme does: and hence we said, That he, who justly separates another by excommunication, cannot be schismatical, because separation in the definition of Schisme, must

must be, and generally is by the Doctors understood, to be a perfect and complete separation, wherein the party separating makes himself, and collects others to him, as a profest seditious party against the whole Church. And this is familiarly expressed by the Fathers, \* already cited, when they say, That Schismaticques do erect *Altare contra Altare*, that they make themselves a party; and so St. Augustine often calls it, *pars Donati*: that they collect others to them, as *Donatus* and his did against *Cecilianus*, and *Novatianus* against *Cornelius*. And never were there any yet branded by the Ancient Doctours, with the name of Schismaticques, who did not this: and we would gladly have the contrary shewed out of them.

S A C T.

## S E C T. 2.

*Containing the first Argument, drawn from the example of Diotrephes, in disproof of the Definition of the Catholique Defendants.*

## P. 9.

**Y**OU acknowledge, that in your definition, separation is taken for separation of ones self actively: Therefore if there be any other active separation, which is truly Schisme, besides the active separation of ones self, then your definition is not perfect.

But there is some other active separation, besides that of ones self, which is truly Schisme: For example, Diotrephes in the Church not receiving St. John, or denying him the communion of that Church, and denying it to the Brethren, and forbidding them that would receive them, and casting them out of the Church, (and all this as loving to have the preheminence) was mortally a Schismaticque, 3 Joan. 9, 10.

## C. 9.

To your Minor we answer, There is no active separation, save that of one self from the

the whole Church, which can properly be termed Schisme.

To your example, we say as you do, That Diotrephes was mortally a Schismaticke: our reason is, because in not receiving St. John, who was his lawfull Pastour, and in communion with the whole Church, he separated himself from him, and from the whole Church. And this he did actively and voluntarily; otherwise he could not have been a Schismaticke.

P. 10. You answer by asserting this, There is no active Separation, save that of ones self from the whole Church, which can properly be termed Schisme. This we shew to be untrue: First, from the example of Diotrephes, who out of affectation of preheminance, both himself received not St. John his lawfull Superiour, nor the Brethren, and forbad them that would receive them; and also cast them out of the Church. (ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐξέβαλεν.) We ask now, was or was not this act of Diotrephes, viz. his casting those good Christians and lively members of Christs mysticall Body out of the Church, (as much as in him lay) an act Schismaticall, or no? viz. The casting out

out of the Church, lively members of Christs mysticall Body, and that for no other cause, but for the keeping due Catholique Communion, was this a schismaticall act or no? We say, highly schismaticall: answer you, we pray, punctually to this Question.

C. 10.

*In your answer you touch not our reason of Diotrephes his Schisme; which was, In not receiving St. John his lawfull superiour, and in Communion with the whole Church; he separated himself from him, and from the whole Church; which was the main substance of our Answer, and the thing wholly important. Answer therefore punctually we request you to this in your next.*

*To that act of Diotrephes, in casting others out of the Church, who communicated with St. John their lawfull Pastour, we answer punctually, That it was schismaticall. For Diotrephes, becoming a Schismaticque by resisting Saint John his Apostolique Authority, all his acts of Ecclesiasticall Jurisdiction upon others were schismaticall; as the acts of Novatianus and Dioscorus, against Cornelius and Leo*

Leo their lawfull Pastours and Superiours, and their casting out such as communicated with them, were schismaticall, and so reputed by the whole Church.

## P. II.

We answer punctually to the point of *Dietrephes*. It was an instance brought by us, (and not by you) to shew, that thrusting others out of the Communion of Christs Church, who were lively members of Christs Mysticall Body, and for that, and no other reason, but for their keeping due Catholique Communion, is properly an act of Schisme. And here we had right our selves to make instance, in which act of *Dietrephes* we pleased to urge for this Argument: Therefore we are no way concerned, in what ever reasons you alledge, to prove another act of *Dietrephes*, viz. his not receiving St. John his lawfull Pastour, to be Schisme.

Whereas we had concluded that point with signally desiring an answer to that question of ours, wherein we told you, we would and did place our argument, was or was not this act of *Dietrephes*, viz. his casting the brethren out of the Churches communion

nion

*nion, for their keeping due Catholick communion, an act Schismaticall, or no? And now you answer, that we touch not your reason of Diotrephes Schisme in another act towards St. John: which as it is a needless diverting us from our pursuit of the question, which we made to you, so also it might have your reason and other reasons also, why it was Schismaticall. And therefore again we were not concerned, no not though we had urged onely that other act, to impugne your reason; for yours impugned not ours, and both might be reasons. And yet you now call your reason affirmed (without your impugning or denying ours) the matter wholly important: whereas if neither your, nor our reason, nor that act were pressed further, we insisted, we told you, on his act of casting out the Brethren out of Communion, for their keeping due and Catholique Communion: and this we say, and for this cause, was highly Schismaticall.*

*In your next Paragraph you answer, That that act of Diotrephes, casting out others, as abovesaid, was Schismaticall. For Diotrephes becoming a Schismaticque by resisting St. John, &c. for you will*  
give



give a reason why it was Schismaticall, a reason of your own. But here again you answer, that which was not asked, nor is at all contrary to us, *viz.* That that which you alledge is a reason that makes his act Schismaticall. But you are wholly silent in that which was urged, whether his act was not Schismaticall, in that he cast out of the Churches Communion lively members of Christs mysticall Body, for their keeping due Catholique Communion. This we expressly in our last affirmed, and desired it might be noted. For if we affirmed this truly, we have done the work in hand *viz.* proved, That an active voluntary separating, or thrusting of others from the Churches Communion in some case, for some cause, is properly Schisme, as well as voluntary separating our selves: and therefore your definition must include both, or else it is not a perfect, but a lame definition. But if you think we did not truly affirme this, why did you not deny our reason? but alledge another reason, which is not to deny ours, and therefore denies not the force of our Argument, except you otherwise deny our Antecedent, on which

we

we inserted our Conclusion.

*C. II.*

*We answer punctually, that we did not make choice of a reason of our own, why Diotrephes was a Schismaticque, but we answered to your reasons as they lay in order. Your words were these: viz.*

*But there is some other active separation, beside that of ones self, which is truly Schisme: for example, Diotrephes in the Church not receiving St. John, or denying him communion of that Church, and denying it to Brethren, and forbidding them that would receive them, and casting them out of the Church.*

*The order of Diotrephes his proceeding stands thus, 3 Joan. 9, 10. First, He receives us not. Secondly, He prattleth against us. Thirdly, He receives not the Brethren. Fourthly, He forbids them that would. Fifthly, He thrusteth them out of the Church. Now we follow the order of the Text, in which the reason of his Schisme, and that which made him a formall Schismaticque, is, He receiveth us not. And you assigned this reason also in the first place. Therefore the charge you put upon us, of making choice of a reason of*

of our owne in your Argument, is a mistake. For we here insisted on the method the sacred Text directs us unto, as also on your own, as upon a second review you must acknowledge. And while you insist no more upon that reason, but upon another, and complain of us for following your own first method, you seem to us inconstant in the proposall of your Arguments.

And we wonder not a little, that you should passe over in silence a direct answer, given to the first part of your objection from Diotrephes, without taking any notice of it, more then if there had been no answer at all given to it: which shewes, that you were not unwilling to have that your reason thought unanswered. But by what is already said on our part, we hope it will appear, that we did not without cause terme our answer to that your first reason, The main substance of our answer, and the thing wholly important. For that was the originall, which made Diotrephes a Schismaticke: the other acts which were subsequent, onely encreasing that crime, contracted by that originall act; as all Judicial acts of Schismatickes do, especially when they contain a new contempt of lawfull Ecclesiasticall power.

Thus

Thus we come to the answer of your question, to which you require a punctual answer; and unto which we gave as punctuall a Categorical answer, as can be given to any question, or proposition, by answering, that it was Schismatical. The reason which we gave was (as you cannot deny) a true and sufficient reason: for all the Juridicall Acts of Schismatiques are Schismatical, and we were not obliged to give more then a sufficient reason.

Yet to comply with you beyond our obligation, we answer further, That as the act of speaking against S. John was in it self tending towards Schisme, so likewise were the subsequent acts of not receiving the Brethren, and casting them out of the Church, because they communicated with S. John: Schismaticall acts in themselves, abstracting from the precedent Schisme of him that did them, not because it was onely an unjust ejection out of that Church, but because it contains in it a contempt and disobedience against the lawfull Apostolicall Pastour of that Church, and by consequence a reiterating an active voluntary separation of Diotrophes from S. John, and by that from the whole Church, ut supra. And in this we  
close

close thus far with you, that whensoever casting another out of the Church is done in opposition and rebellion to all the lawfull Hierarchicall Pastours of the Church then in power, it is a Schismaticall act, as this of Diotrephes was; because it containes a voluntary Separation of those who did it, from the whole true visible Church of Christ, which is our definition.

P. 12.

You define Schisme to be a voluntary Separation of one part from the whole true visible Church of Christ.

You further explain your self, That in your Definition, first, Separation is taken for Separation of ones self actively, and not Separation of another by excommunication.

We except to your Definition. Because something within the compass of Schisme is ones voluntary Separation of others, (over whom he hath or pretendeth Jurisdiction) by unjust ejecting, or casting him out. This you acknowledge not to be contained in the separation which your definition intends: for so are your words. *In our definition of Schisme, separation is taken, for separation of ones self actively,*

actively, and not a separation of another by excommunication, whereby another is separated passively.

Now then since every active separation of another by unjust excommunication, (though active and voluntary) is a separation of another by excommunication, whereby another is separated passively; it is not included in that separation, which is intended in your definition, (for you say, separation of another by excommunication is not included) and if it be not included in the separation mentioned in your definition, then it is not included in the *genus* of your definition, and consequently not in your definition, (for the *differentia* is alwayes within the compass of the *genus*) yet this we contend to be Schisme; therefore your definition is no definition.

You answer, That there is no active separation, save that of ones self from the whole Church, which can properly be termed Schisme. These your very words.

Now that we might make instance irrefragible of some act of separation of another from the Church, which were Schisme;

Schisme; it is sufficient to alledge any act of any one that is such. For the Person, we first instance in *Diotrephes*, in whom, as there were severall Schismaticall acts of separation by us then so far recounted, as we thought meet: amongst those acts, after our allegation of them, in our very next, we single out one of those acts (of the other acts not doubting but both sides were agreed) and desire you to speak to that act (since any one active separation is enough for our conclusion to be inferred against you, and it was in our choice, which act we would insist on) of *Diotrephes* casting out those good Christians, lively members of Christs mystical Body, and that for no other cause pretended, but for their keeping that Communion, which you and we know to have been due Catholique Communion. Was, or was not, said we, (in our very second allegation of those acts) this act done for this cause, *viz.* Their keeping due Catholique Communion, a Schismatical act or no? You in your reply to this question say, it was: alledging, say we, another reason, nor yet denying ours; which we replied, not to be an answer to our question, unless you had allowed, or denied our



reason, of which we asked you: for we asked you, was this casting out the Brethren for no other cause pretended, but for their keeping that Communion, which you and we know to have been due Catholique communion; was this act schismaticall? Now in your replies, even this your last, your insisting on all those acts in the method and order of the Text, five in all, and as our own words called for (*if we review them*, say you) you see we have reviewed them, and plainly finde you were admonished by our words, (who brought your argument) to spare your pains of considering all those acts, or reasons, and to speak to what your Opponent urgeth upon you, *viz.* This act of his casting out, and that for no other pretended cause, but for their keeping of that Communion which they did. So that if you consider it, you will have no cause to object to us inconstancy in our proposall of our Argument, but constant advertising you not to make needlesse diversions, in asserting that which was not controverted, nor gain-said; and so also your wonder may cease, why when we twice called you to speak, to what we (who were your Opponents) urged as our  
Argu-

Argument, you answering to another agreed part of the Text, we passe it over. How could you fear, that we would have that our reason to be thought unanswered, who called you twice punctually to speak to another part of the Text; and that former was mentioned by us, not as our reason of the inference of our conclusion, but as our instance of *Diotrephes* Schisme, wherein we knew you would agree with us; and yet you have never done with it. If that were in your judgement the original reason, which made *Diotrephes* a Schismaticque; 'twas not the principall instance of your Opponents, on which they professed their inference to depend, to which the Respondents should attend and speak.

At last, you come to give us a punctuall answer, *It was Schismaticall*. This was not a punctual answer. Our question was, was this act done for no other pretended cause, but their keeping of that Communion, which you and we know due and Catholique Communion, Schismaticall? The reason you give, is not in answer to us at all; for you cannot pretend that your reason denies ours to be a reason; and we had alledged, that if our reason

be yielded, (*id est*, not denied, as you now here do not, nor can deny) then such active separating, or casting out another for some such cause as we alledge, is schismaticall; whereas you had in the head of this discourse laid down this *Thesis*, *There is no active separation, save that of ones self from the whole Church, which can properly be termed Schisme.*

We had indeed our selves granted, yea contended, that he also which separateth others unjustly from the Church Communion, doth thereby indeed (if not separate before) consequentially separate himself from the Church: So *Firmilian* to *Stephen*, "Thou hast cut off thy self, do  
 "not deceive thy self; forasmuch as he  
 "is truly schismaticall, saith *Firmilian*,  
 "who hath made himself an Apostate  
 "from the Communion of Ecclesiasticall  
 "Unity, for while thou thoughtest to cut  
 "off others from thee, thou hast cut off  
 "thy self from all. Thus far *Firmilian*.

Finally, when you will grant such act schismaticall, yet you say, *Not because it was onely an unjust ejection out of the Church*, which is again to say nothing in answer to us; for we never said, it was onely an unjust ejection out of the Church,

Church, and therefore could not say, *Because* it was onely an unjust ejection, &c. so you refute no body. It is enough for us, and for our conclusion, to say it was a schismaticall act, because it was an unjust ejection out of the Church, not *because* onely, &c.

Your last restriction we reject, and averre that all unjust and criminal ejections of others (who are lively members of Christs mystical Body) out of Church-Communion, for holding fast those things which belong to members of the holy Catholique Church, as she is the holy Catholique Church, is highly and mortally Schismaticall. And this we averre, whether all or any other (beside the separatours themselves) of the lawfull Hierarchicall Pastours of the Church then in power, do at all take knowledge, or notice of such their act of separating, or those separations of them.

\* *These (29) precedent Pages have been examined as they stand here, before both parties, and found agreeing with another Copy, which is signed with both our hands, as this is; and so are to have credit with both parts, so far as they agree together.*

Note that this Subscription relates to the authenticall written original.

*Petrus. G.*

*Foannes T.*

## C. 12.

Your something too much (as we conceive) adhesion to your own defence, inforces us to utter what otherwise (out of the respect we bear you) might have remained buried in perpetual silence. The plain truth therefore is, that you discovered not in the proposing your first reason in Diotrephes his case, the true sense of the word, whereon you grounded it, viz. He receiveth us not. For you took it for an excommunication of S. John made against him by Diotrephes, as appears by your saying thus, Not receiving S. John, or denying him the Communion of that Church, as if those two expressions were Synonyma's: and hence follows, that as you gave precedency of place to this reason before the others; so you attributed to it the preheminence of power to prove your intent against us, in your first proposall of this argument. For if to cast others out of the Church were so mortall a Schismaticall act, as you say it was, because they received not S. John, by a more forcible reason must you have esteemed the denying S. John himself the communion of that Church (which is equivalent to a casting him out of that Church) to have been a most grievous mortall sin of Schisme: for propter quod  
unum-

*unumquodque tale, & illud magis. Now when we had made a full discovery of the true meaning of those words, He receiveth us not, in our answer, and thereby rendred this first part of your argument drawn from them, not onely of no effect to serve your turn, but of main strength to confirm our definition, you first concealed our answer, neither yielding any satisfaction to it, nor taking any notice of it in your reply to that Paragraph: and then being challenged by us of this preterition; you quitted this first reason, and removed the whole strength of your argument to the last of your reasons, alledging that the argument being yours, you might insist upon what reason you pleased, which you esteemed most important for you in it. How dissonant this your position is to the rules of disputation, we make appear thus.*

*For though it be most true, in the first proposall of an argument, that the Opponent may pitch upon what reason he pleaseth for his best advantage; yet when he hath once actually propounded any, as you did this in proof of your Minor, according to all laws and principles of Logicall Disputes, he stands obliged to maintain every one of them, if the Respondent except against them, or answer to them, as here we did to yours;*

and cannot recede from any of them without a note of Disadvantage to himself and his cause. For what rationally person will not judge that Opponent worsted, who maintains not every reason, that he hath objected against his Adversary? Neither will your saying, that you insisted onely after your answer was given upon your last reason, as esteeming it most forcible for you against us. For first, I have made it clear, that in your first Proposall, you esteemed your first reason, either as much or more forcible, then your last, till the weakness of it was discovered by our answer. And again, if you insist now so much upon your last reason, because you conceive it forcible for you against us; all Equity will say, That it is lawfull for us to insist upon the weakness of your first reason, and the strength of our answer to it; because we conceive it makes as much for us against you. Whether therefore you proposed not this first reason, of not receiving St. John, unpremeditatedly; concealed the answer to it, artificially; disallowed it to be yours, ungroundedly; charged it upon our chusing of it, undeservedly; quitted it too facilely; and adhered solely to another less constantly; we leave it to the impartiall judgement of any understanding Hearer, or Reader,



*Reader, who is, or shall be rightly informed of the whole proceeding on both sides in this particular : and withall require, that you acknowledge expressly, that this your first reason propounded by you, in your Argument of Diotrepthes, is of no force ; and that our Reply to it stands unanswered, before you proceed further.*

P. 13.

In the beginning of this reply, something that should have lain buried, out of respect to us, as you are pleased to say, you would seem now provoked to bring up from the grave, (or raise a dust against us) laying aside, to wit, those respects you formerly bear us ; and hereto provoked it seems by nothing from us, (as your own reason acknowledges) but onely by our *too much* (as you judge it) *adhesion to our own defence*. Now why, we pray you, should our adhesion to our own defence, which we judge most just, and charitable, and inoffensive to any, move you to sollicite the Graves, and to go about, when you cannot perswade by Argument, to affright by an apparition of something, which yet afterwards never appears? We finding in our selves no passion of fear, intreat you to recall your minds from any

passion whatsoever, and to return to such quiet reasoning, as becomes the subject matter of our conference, which is for ecclesiasticall love and union, against Schisme and uncharitableness.

You tell us, *We discovered not in our proposing the first reason in Diotrephes case, the true sense of the words whereon we grounded it, viz. He receiveth us not.* In which reply we discover, and will lay before you many affected mistakes. For we never propounded *first, second, or third* reason in *Diotrephes* his case, but these were divisions of reasons made by your selves now and heretofore, and never by us. The occasion did not require any such diversity of reasons, neither did the manner of our introduction of that example signifie any multiplicity of reasons intended. The occasion was onely to shew, that some act, beside the separating ones self is Schismaticall; and the proving any one such act, was sufficient to make that good; therefore the occasion required no such diversity of reasons, as well as no diversity of reasons was named.

Next, our introduction of the example of *Diotrophes* was after this manner. *B. 3.*  
*But there is some other active separation be-*

*side*

side that of ones self, which is truly Schism; for example Diotrephes, &c. The manner of which introduction of the example doth no way signifie, that we intended severall reasons, by producing of the words which follow. For it is most evident, that if any one act of *Diotrephes* were an active voluntary separation (which both sides required) and not of himself, and yet that act were Schismaticall, it were abundantly sufficient to prove, That some other active separation, beside that of ones self, is truly Schisme: Which were our inductive words. Therefore the introduction of the example of *Diotrephes* did no way signifie, that we intended any diversity of reasons in the words produced. Wherefore since the occasion of the example did not require, and our introduction of it did not signifie any diversity of reasons in the case of *Diotrephes*: in the next place we ask you, do you finde any where, in any our propounding of our reasoning from the case of *Diotrephes*, or of the words which we mentioned out of 3. S. *John* v. 9. any mention of first and second reason, &c. Or can you put upon us, that 'tis impossible we should finde any just occasion once to maintain

any.

any words in v. 9. 10. which go before  
 ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐκβάλλει, but that we must  
 needs profess to urge them as an argu-  
 ment before our argument, out of those  
 words, *He casteth them out of the Church.*  
 If you will still instead of answering our  
 Argument, be finding out suspicions of  
 other arguments already disavowed by  
 us, shew some colour from our words, or  
 the occasion of our words, or the intro-  
 duction of our reason. As for our part,  
 we truly affirm, that we intended and al-  
 ledged but *one reason*, grounded on one act  
 of *Diotrephes*, as we have adhered in the  
 tenure of our discourse to no more then  
*one*. This therefore is your first importu-  
 nate mistake, in attributing to us *the pro-*  
*posall of our first reason in Diotrephes case* :  
 which implies a proposall of two reasons  
 at least, whereas we never propounded  
 any more, as a reason, then *one*. The se-  
 cond mistake is, that we grounded our rea-  
 son upon these words, *He receiveth us not.*  
 For as we intended but one reason, so that  
 our one reason we grounded not upon  
 those words. For being that one act of  
 that nature which we pretended, was  
 enough to prove our *Minor*, and to over-  
 throw your definition, as by you explain-  
 ed.

ed : if we had intended in those words to have proved it by that act contained in those words, *He receiveth us not*, we would once have said so. But be that of *not receiving S. John*, or be it not notorious Schisme, which nor then, nor now, did we, or do we affirm or deny, we intending to urge something that should be clearly and confessedly an unjust casting others out of the Communion of the Church, and not onely (as possibly might have been pretended) a subduction of obedience, and denying the Communion of subordination to a superiour : we professed to intend to ground our reason upon the last words (as we have alwayes told you) viz. ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐκβάλλει, and made use of the precedent words onely for the better understanding ; and to say the truth, not onely for the joyning of them to *Diotrephes* the Schismaticque, but to his Character *οἰστροπυλέων*, and therefore we added, *and in all this loving to have the preheminency*. We deny therefore that we ever grounded any alledged reason of ours for the proof of our *Minor*, upon those words, *He receiveth us not* : and we declare, that we produced those words onely as antecedent and necessary.

cessary to lead you to those following words, which did contain the reason, for which we alledged the example of *Diotrephes*.

Thirdly, you blame us in that we discovered not the true sense of those words, whereas we were not to be blamed, if we did not; because we had no occasion, much lesse obligation, to insist to discover the sense of those words: and why that should be objected to us, which did no way concern us, we cannot apprehend. But because we gave a gloss upon those words, which you say, did not discover the true sense, and when you come to speak of your own reply, your selves say of your selves, *That you made a full discovery of the true meaning of those words, He receiveth us not* Let us a while conferre our transient *Glosse* with your full discovery.

Our words were these, *Diotrephes* in the Church not receiving *S. John*, or denying him the Communion of that Church. Your words were these. In not receiving *S. John*, who was his lawfull Pastour, and in Communion with the whole Church, he separated himself from him, and from the whole. We, who intended not to insist on  
any

any full discovery, gave by the way a glosse, which no man can deny to be a true interpretation of those words: For it is most certain and evident, that when S. *John* wrote to the Church, he which received him not, denied him the Communion of the Church, to which he wrote; and the *deniall of Communion* is as large a speech, and contains as much as the *not receiving* can contain. For S. *John* having right of Communion with that Church, and by that right, having a power to write to them Directions and Precepts, which they were obliged to receive; and he actually writing, and thereby requiring the receipt, he which *received him not*, plainly denied him the Communion of the Church: and he which sayes, he denied him the Communion of the Church, sayes as much as he which sayes, *he received him not*. Therefore our Gloss, though short, was a true interpretation, whereas your *full discovery of the true meaning of these words* looks not upon the meaning of the words at all in their true and formal sense, but at something to be necessarily adjoynd to them either antecedently or consequently. For he which received not Saint *John*, knowing  
**him**



him to be his lawful Pastour, and in Communion with the whole Church, must according to your maner of reasoning be a formal schismaticke, at least *animo*, in will and affection, before that non-reception; but by your Tenet also, none can be a formall Schismaticke, but by separating himself from the whole Church: Therefore *Diotrephes* separating himself from the whole Church, could not be the meaning of those words, *He receiveth us not*. Or if you will say, that in not receiving *St. John*, *Diotrephes* separated himself from *St. John*; and being *St. John* was in communion with the whole, he consequentially separated himself from the whole Church, and thereby became a formall Schismaticke: this is not the discovery of the meaning of the words, but a declaration of the consequence of them, which you would give, when no man called for it, nor occasion required.

But when you say, that therefore our Exposition did not discover the Truth, because *we took it*, say you, *for an Excommunication of St. John by Diotrephes*, we wonder how you come to know, and to affirm, we took it so, since we never said so; and (if that be not enough) we  
never

never thought so. But it appears, say you, by our saying thus, [*Not receiving St. John, or denying him the communion of that Church,*] as if those two Expressions were Synonimous. Why, be or be not those two Expressions Synonimous, yet unless denying St. John the Communion of that Church, and Excommunication of St. John be Synonima's also, your accusation of us hath no connexion with your proof: and Synonima's these are not, forasmuch as there may be a denying Communion, (*viz.* a Communion of Subordination, as this here denied was) which is no Excommunication.

Now after so many mistakes, ye begin to make your inconsequent inferences: For from hence you say followes, *That as we gave precedency of place to this reason before the other, so we attributed to it the preheminence of power, to prove our intents against you.* To which we answer, First, that we gave but one reason, and therefore we gave not precedency of place to this reason before another: For where there is no diversity, there can be no precedency. Secondly, That we did not attribute to it, the preheminence of power, to prove our intents against you; for that

in our argumentation we placed no pre-  
 heminence of power, or proof in it. We  
 intended it not against you any further,  
 then as a way to bring you to those  
 words, wherein we intended to lay force  
 against you; all which our next reply did  
 immediately signifie.

This your unreasonable affirmation is  
 but little in respect of your wonderfull  
 undertaken Ratiocination. For you will  
 not onely affirm we used that Argument;  
 which we never did, but you will prove  
 by reason that we must do so; which is a  
 strange way of a Respondent, to extort  
 an Argument from an Opponent (because  
 he thinks he can answer it better, then  
 that which is brought by him.) *For if to*  
*cast others out of the Church, you say, &c.*  
 Were your Argument good, and that  
*Non-reception* were equivalent to Ejecti-  
 on, yet it would not prove, that we gave  
 the preheminence to that reason, or must  
 use that for a reason, except you had first  
 proved, that we alwayes must do what-  
 soever we might do; and that we al-  
 wayes thought those terms equivalent  
 which you do.

You proceed to let us know, how much  
 you have been too hard for us; for you  
 rendred

rendred this first part of our Argument, not onely of no effect to serve our turn, but of main strength to confirm your definition; which were two great acts in a Respondent, if you had as truly performed, as pretended them. If what we produced for our purpose, had been so well managed by us, that it had not onely been improper to prove our intent; but also had proved that which we intended to destroy, we must needs either have made an ill Argument, or have maintained a bad Cause. But you were far from making those words of none effect to serve our turn; for if they did cohere with the words which follow, in which alone we placed our Argument, they have and will serve our turn sufficiently; and such a coherence, you have not, you cannot deny. And that you made them *of main strength to confirm your definition*, is so far from truth, that it hath no colour of it. For this being questioned in your definition, whether another act besides a separation of ones self, be schismatical; and you affirming, that you understood in your definition no other act, but the separation of ones self, there was no other way for you to confirme that

that definition which was questioned, but by proving that which was questioned. Now being it was never questioned, whether he which separateth himself be schismaticall: since you did nothing else in your discovery, but assert that *Diotrephes* did separate himself from the whole Church; (how truly we do not here enquire) it followeth that you made those words of no strength at all to confirm your definition.

Upon these mistaken grounds you begin to charge, first, that we *concealed your answer*: and 'tis true, we gave no express reply to the words of your answer (which were no answer to our Argument) not that we intended to conceal it, for we could not, it being written in the front of our Reply, but to avoid that diversion, which the Auditours now finde by your importunate repetition of it since, to have followed, and to bring our Argument to a speedy issue, which we earnestly desired. Observing therefore, that you had mistaken those words of *St. John*, in which we placed our Argument: and being resolved, as we told you before, *not to be nice with you*, nor to multiply Replies without necessity, we passed that by, which was  
onely

onely your mistake, and shewed you plainly where we placed our Argument. From this causeless and unnecessary charge, you proceed to a second, which is manifestly false, saying, That we *being advertised by you of this preterition, quitted our first reason, and removed the whole strength of our Argument to the last of our reasons.* This we declare to be untrue: for we expressly and punctually gave you notice, that we plac'd our Argument in the last words cited out of St. *John*, before you gave us any advertisement of that preterition. And we need no more then the papers themselves to declare the truth of this reply, and to detect the error of your charge. For we plainly rectified the mistake, and shewed our argument to be placed in the last words of St. *John*, ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐκβάλλει, in our reply, B. 6. whereas you did not advertise us of this preterition, until your answer, A. 7. And indeed you could not advertise us of the preterition, before we shewed our Argument to be placed in the last words: because the onely reason why we passed by your answer, was, for that we had not placed our Argument in those words, to which you directed your answer; which

which we shewed not by saying so, but by expressing in which words we placed them. At the same time then, and in the same Reply we passed your answer by, and gave notice where our reason lay; and the giving notice of our reason, was the cause of the preterition. You could not therefore know of the preterition, before you must take notice of the particular placing of the reason: and therefore to charge us with shifting our argument after your advertisement, is to say, not onely that which is untrue, but that which in this case was impossible to be true.

All this mistake will appear most manifestly, if we look but upon the method of the written papers. For first you mistake the words in which we placed our reason. A. 6. Then we advertised you in which words our reason was placed. B. 6. After that, you tell us of the preterition. A. 7. And we reply, that the instance of *Diotrephes* was our own, and therefore we might make use of what act of *Diotrephes* we pleased. B. 7. Here you charge us with saying, *That the Argument being ours, we might insist upon what reason we pleased*, following your constant mistake: for we never said *what reason*, but *what act* we



we pleased, intending to make use of but one reason, and that grounded upon one act, which we pleased. And certainly when we had produced the instance of *Diotrephes*, it was our right, and no injury to be complained of by any, that we might instance in what one act we pleased, except we were obliged to prove every act of *Diotrephes*, which he did, to be Schismaticall, and no act of his to be a separation of himself, which we are sure we were not.

As to the obligation of an Opponent to maintain every one of his reasons, it concerns us not in this particular: because in this case of *Diotrephes* we propounded but one, and that we were ready to maintain, when we could once get you to deny it. And if an Opponent be in a bad condition, who maintains not every reason produced, (especially by the Respondent himself) certainly the Respondent is in a worse, who answers not every reason objected by his Opponent. For if one reason brought by the Opponent be unanswered, the Respondents cause must fall, though all the rest of the Opponents arguments were invalid.

Wherefore we hope it will not be inter-

terpreted ill manners, if we do not say as you dictate to us, That *we insisted onely upon the last reason*, but we insisted upon one onely reason, which was contained in the last words. And whereas you say, *We have made it clear, we esteemed our first reason, either as much or more forcible then the last*: To passe by your constant impropriety of a first reason, when there was but one; certainly 'tis manifest you have not made it clear in this Reply, and as manifest it is, that you never mentioned it before. We never said it was as forceable, we never thought it so, you never till now so much as said we thought so: and therefore how you have made it clear we cannot imagine. We must therefore still insist (not upon the last reason, but) upon the last words produced, because they are a pregnant instance of some active separation, beside that of ones self. And if you will still insist upon the weaknesse of our first reason, (as you call it) you may; but if you do, you will plainly manifest your intention, to spinne out the time in that which is no way pertinent to the cause: and when you have spent your selves upon this, we must expect you should proceed to the two next acts of

*Diotrephes*, mentioned by us as, much as the first, viz. *That he received not the Brethren, and forbad them that would.*

Wherefore we now in compliance with your appeal, leave it likewise to the impartiall judgement of the Hearer, whether we propounded the first reason, *of not receiving St. John* (for we would not envy the Auditors the musick of your Rhythmicall Cadencies) *unpremeditatedly*, or concealed your answer to it *artificially*, or disallowed it to be ours *ingroundedly*, or charged it upon your chusing of it *undeservedly*, or quit it to *facily*, and adhered to another *lesse constantly*.

First, whether we propounded it *unpremeditatedly*, who propounded it not all; who have brought to the test your meditations: which notwithstanding we remain yet unconvinced, that we ever propounded that Argument either *premeditatedly* or *unpremeditatedly*; whether we concealed your answer to it *artificially*, who used no art at all to conceal it; but passing it by as unnecessary, and distinctly as we could, propounding our own reason, concealed onely your impertinency. Whether we disallowed it to be ours un-

D

ground-

groundedly, who must needs know best which are our own reasons and grounds, and which not: and do certainly know, that you found no ground in our words, that this was one of ours. Whether we charged it upon your chusing of it undeservedly, when we our selves never made choice of it; and it belongeth not to you to chuse our Arguments for us. Whether we quitted it too facilely, who never quitted it at all, because we never acknowledged it, and yet you go on never to quit it. Whether we adhered solely to another lesse constantly, when the reason we produced was not another, because but one, and to that one we adhered most constantly.

## C. 13.

*In answer to your often reiterated denials, that you either pressed or framed any first or second reason, &c. in your first proposall of the instance of Diotrephes, we alledge your formall and expresse words, which are these, Page I. B. 4. viz. But there is some active separation, beside that of ones self, which is truly Schisme: for example, Diotrephes in the Church not receiving St. John, or denying him the Communion of*  
that

that Church, and denying it to the Brethren, and forbidding them that would receive them, and casting them out of the Church, (and all this as loving to have the preheminance) was mortally a Schismaticque. Thus you. Now first we referre it to the judgement of any indifferent Auditor, whether any judicall Reader by the sole force of these words can gather, that you placed your Argument in this first proposall, onely in the last act of Diotrephes, of casting out the Brethren, and in none of the former: or what reasonable argument can be drawn from these words precisely, that all the precedent words were used by you onely, for the better understanding, and as antecedent and necessary to lead us to those following words, &c. (as you say in your last reply) and we desire, that the precise words in the forecited of yours be particularly specified, which signifie this difference: and if no such difference of placing your argument onely in the last act of Diotrephes mentioned, can be efficaciously deduced from any of them, we hope that the Auditors will judge, that we had just reason to think in our Reply to this first proposall, to conceive that you placed your Argument as well in

the first act of Diotrephes here specified, as in the last. And standing in the same reason we had also just occasion to say, that you having signified no difference betwixt them in your first proposall, you shifted off your Argument from the first to the last of those acts; onely after you had seen our answer, whereby it appeared, that the first act of Diotrephes here specified by you, was of no advantage to your cause. For had you placed your Argument in this first proposall, in the last act alone, and proceeded clearly and candidly with the Auditours, and your Adversaries, you should in that very first proposall have declared it: and not onely after you were pressed to it by our Reply. Further, if you say that you had not settled your Argument to any one of those foresaid acts of Diotrephes in the first proposition of that instance; we demand, why then did you send it us to be answered, being onely an undeterminate and ambiguous Argument? Or how could you demand a determinate answer to it from us, whilst you had determined nothing in it: and we could not gather from the precise words, that it was indetermined, but rather that it embraced all the acts determinately there mentioned by you: which



which manner of proposition could not be fair in a Logickall Dispute. For to what act of Diotrephes soever we had framed our answer, you had still this effugium left open to you to tell us your Argument was not placed in that, but in another act.

Secondly, in the forecited Sentence of yours, we demand to what these words, viz. and all this, are referred. Surely not to the last act alone; for that cannot be said to be all this; that is, the whole complex of all those acts, before related of Diotrephes, unlesse you make one of them alone to be all, and a sole part to be the whole: But these words must necessarily be related to them all, and to every one of those foresaid acts; and you must mean, that they were all infected with the schismaticall pride and insatiable of Diotrephes, as loving to have the preheminance; which you adde, to give force to the proving of that complex of acts to have been mortally schismaticall: and consequently that by the said whole complex he was made mortally a Schismaticque. For why is either that ambition named in Scripture, or specified by you (unlesse you inserted it as a meer Pärergon, and making nothing to your present intent) but to



*The proposall of the first  
give evidence of the schismaticall pride of  
Diotrephes.*

*When therefore you say in your last Reply. That you joyned these words, not onely to Diotrephes the Schismaticque, but to his Character, φιλοπρωτεύων, you acknowledge, that all those acts were related to his Schisme, both immediately in his schismaticall person, and mediately to his schismaticall spirit. Nay, even in your second proposall of your Argument from Diotrephes, though you demand an answer particularly to the last act of casting out the Brethren, &c. as judging it of most force amongst them, to prove your intent, yet you clearly place your Argument in them all. For you say thus in your Answer to our Reply, pag. 2. B. 5. where you say to us these following words: viz. You answer by asserting this, There is no active separation, save that of ones self, from the whole Church, which can properly be termed Schisme. This we shew to be untrue; first, from the example of Diotrephes, who out of affectation of preheminance, both himself received not St. John, his lawfull Superiour, nor the Brethren, and forbid them that would receive them, and also*  
cast

cast them out of the Church. Where you most evidently labour to shew our assertion to be untrue, both from Diotrefhes his not receiving St. John, &c. and also from his casting out the Brethren: and therefore you cannot restrain your Argument to this last act alone, without retracting your own words, and plainly contradicting your selves. Whence it appears, with how little truth you say in your last Reply, that you placed your Argument in the last words of Saint John, in rñs, &c. before you were warned of the preterition, by our answer: for there you placed your Argument in all, but insisted principally on the last, of casting out the Brethren.

What you here affirm, That you took not denying St. John the Communion of that Church, for an Excommunication of him, but for a denying of Communion of Subordination to him; which (say you, and that truly) is not Excommunication, appears manifestly by your own words now cited, to be untrue. For when you had said, Or denying him the Communion of that Church, you presently adde, and denying it to the Brethren; which signified, that he denied the same Communion to St. John,

which be denied to the Brethren; which could be no Communion of subordination, that is, of an inferiour to a superiour, by subtraction of Obedience, but of a superiour to an inferiour by excommunication. And again, if you had meant thereby a denying onely the Communion of subordination, by contempt of St. Johns Apostolicall authority; you had spoken in a sense quite destructive of the intention, for which that instance of Diotrophes was brought by you; which was to prove some active separation properly Schisme, which is not a separation of ones self. Now such a deniall of Communion to St. John would have been a separation of himself from the Church, as we have proved, and you deny not.

As to what you often affirm in your last Reply, that you propounded not a plurality of reasons, but one onely reason, we oppose your clear words, (\*) page 11. where you term the particulars, which your words contain, acts or reasons: and you stile the first act, whereto we answered, the originall reason, which made Diotrophes a Schismaticke; and which you laboured to avoid, onely by endeavouring

vowing to shew, that you grounded your Argument upon the false unjust casting out of the Brethren, &c. and which we have shewed to be untrue.

Yet here give me leave to note by the way, that to induce your Reader to think that your words rather are to be referred to the ambition of Diotrophes, then to his Schisme, you miscite your own words: for whereas you say in the fore-named place, thus, And all this as loving to have the preheminance, in the Nominative case, and so clearly agreeing with all the former acts; here you cite it in the Ablative case, diverting them from a direct reference to these acts, and referring or tying them to his ambitious Spirit: you cite them thus, And in all this loving to have the preheminance: where you adde one word, and leave out another and thereby you much change the sense. For where you say in your text, and all this, &c. whereon we ground our Argument, that it was referred to all the precedent acts, and to his Schisme you make your selves to say, and in all this loving to have the preheminance, which much abates the force of that relation, and ties the words directly to his ambition, which every one will say is no very

fair proceeding. Till therefore you fatisfie these reasons, you stand obnoxious to all the impeachments, whereof we accused you in our last reply. And thus the luster of your

This their (\*) five-leav'd flower is ter-  
Reply was nish'd, which indeed was a fair  
comprised one, and shewed the ricknesse of  
in five that soyl, from whence it sprung;  
leaves, yet would have appeared much  
fairer, had it not intangled it self in so ma-  
ny sharp and piercing thorns.

## P. 14.

You begin your reply in answer to our reiterated denials, where we observe two things. First, that you glance at our reiterations. Secondly, that you frame your answer to our denials. For the first, if our reiteration of denials be a fault, it is your own, (not ours) who so often necessitate us to reiterate them by your willfull and continuall mistakes. So often as you call them *reasons*, we must disclaim them; and as often as you urge the multiplicity of them, we must deny them; and oftner then you have done so, we have not mentioned them. This reiteration then in us, is nothing but a constant adhering to, and clearing

clearing of our Argument. Secondly, in the framing of your Answer to our denials, you urge *our words*; to our *reasons* you urge nothing; that is, as the case now stands, you deny our conclusion, but deny no premise. In our last Reply, we gave you not a naked deniall, but we produced Arguments, to prove the reasonableness of our deniall; none of which have you touched in the least: and therefore we must professe our Paper yet unanswered.

## C. 14.

*If you had made, or can make good what you here affirm, your reiterations are no fault at all. Decies repetita placebunt. But as I hope it will presently appear, that in these reiterations you do onely Æthiopem lavare, whom the more you wash, the clearer his blacknesse will appear. Concerning the Answer to your reasons we will presently speak.*

## P. 15.

This discourse of yours might have been something towards an endeavour to prove, that we produced severall reasons in the case of *Diotrephes*; but it is no answer, nor can it pretend to be to the  
main



main of our discourse, which hath proved the contrary. Supposing therefore our former Arguments, which you have not so much as endeavoured to answer, to be still in force, and so the reasonableness of the denial on our side to be sufficiently proved, we proceed to clear those Objections you have newly raised.

## C. 15.

*Your reasons were onely drawn from the occasion and introduction of your Argument, which according to reason, required that it should be placed onely in an act, which was an active separation beside that of ones self; and therefore say you, you were not to be thought to have placed it in any of the said acts, save that of casting others out of the Church: because that onely was of force to prove it.*

*Now this reason of yours supposes, that you are to be thought alwayes to do (in your Arguments) that which reason requires to be done: whosoever therefore proves that you did not in the proposall of this Argument, what reason required you should have done, destroyes that supposition; and thereby answers your Argument grounded upon it. If therefore your expresse words shew evidently,*



ly, that you did not place your Argument more in that last act, then in any of the others, your reasons are answered. Seeing then, by citing your express words, we shew that you did not in them place your Argument more in the last, then in the former acts, as reason required you should have done, we shew that you have not done in them, what reason required to have been done. And thus we have by your own words so overthrow your reasons, that they needed no particular answer: and so your accusing us not to have answered what we have answered, is vain and groundlesse. The reasons therefore, which you draw from the occasion and introduction, shew what according to reason you should have done; and our answer drawn from your enumeration of acts, without pitching upon any one more then another, in the first proposall of them, shew that you have not done what reason required you should have done. The first proposall of your Argument and enumeration of acts in Diotrephe is this viz. For example, Diotrephe in the Church not receiving Saint John, or denying him the Communion of that Church, & denying it to the brethren, and  
for-

forbidding them that would receive them, and casting them out of the Church (and all this as loving to have the preheminence) was mortally a Schismaticke. Gather, Reader from these precise words, that you placed your Argument in the last act onely (as you say reason required you should have done) and in none of the former, Et eris mihi magnus Apollo.

P. 16.

First, you alledge our formall and expresse words, B. 5. But there is some other active separation, &c. Then you referre it to the Auditours, whether any Judiciall Reader (which we understand not) by the sole force of these words can gather, that we placed our Argument onely in the last act of Diotrephes: or what reasonable Argument can be drawn from these words precisely, to that purpose. To which we answer, first, that though these precise words should not of themselves shew, that our Argument was placed in the last act onely, yet if any thing else had shewed it, it were sufficient. And we have already proved, nor is our proof as yet contradicted, that something else did shew as much, viz. The occasion and manner of the intro-

introduction of the example of Diot-  
trephes.

The introduction and occasion of the ex-  
ample of Diotrephes shew onely what in  
reason you should have done: but the equall  
proposall of all those acts belonging to that  
example, shew that you did not what in rea-  
son you should have done. Now the question  
is onely what you did, not what in reason you  
should have done; or whether or no you did  
in this precise proposall, that which you  
should have done in it: and it is manifest  
you have not done it. For reason required,  
that you should not onely intend to place your  
Argument in the last act alone (as you  
would have it) but that you should have  
signified in that proposall, that you placed it  
in that sole act, in pitching by some particu-  
lar expression, upon that act alone: and not  
upon any of the former. Now it is most evi-  
dent, that you have done no such matter in  
that precise enumeration of acts. There-  
fore you have not done what reason required  
you should have done.

P. 17.

Secondly we answer further, That if  
they had not shewed so much as we have  
proved

proved they have, yet the formall and expresse words framed by us, and recited by you, if well considered by any judicious Reader, signifie the same. For we assigned those words of St. *John*, as containing in them expressly an active separation of some from the Church, which was not an active and voluntary separation of himself that did make the separation. And no other act of *Diotrephes* by us mentioned, but that last, of casting the Brethren out of the Church; can be lookt upon as formally such: but that act of casting the Brethren out of the Church, is truly and formally such. Therefore any judicious Reader might by the force of these words gather, that we placed our Argument in the last act of *Diotrephes*.

C. 17.

The consequence of your Argument here expressed, supposes, that every judicious man is obliged to judge, that you brought no act to prove your intent, but that one-ly which effectually proves it; and so all must be defective in judgement (in your estimate) who esteem you not so invincible Disputants, that all your Arguments are Evidences and Demonstrations.

For

For if you may be subject to urge an Argument, which proves not effectually your intent why may not a judicious person judge you have done so in this particular? Why may not a judicious person judge, that you esteemed some acts here mentioned of Diotrepes, in your first proposall, to be unjust separations from the Church, besides that of ones self, which were indeed not so. It were very strange to think, that every one should want judgement, who judges both that you may be, and are deceived in the proposall of your Arguments. Nay, we adde further, that there is great occasion given by you here, for judicious persons to judge that you were deceived. For though none of the former acts were an active separation from the Church, beside that of ones self, (as you here confesse) and so in conducing to prove your assertion; yet certain it is, that in the first proposall of your Argument, you judged at least one of them to be so, namely, the deniall of the communion of that Church to those who received St. John: For what is the denying the Churches communion  
to.

to others, who are subjects, but a separation of them from the Church? And seeing this was done by their Bishop, it must have the nature of Excommunication, and is therefore differenced by you in the next page, from the denying that Churches communion to St. John, and properly included in your Definition, (which you undertake to defend by this Argument) under the title of Communion of Coordination: and B. 3. you acknowledge Excommunication to be a separation of another from the Churches Communion; therefore you understood, that denying the Churches communion to those who received St. John, to be an active separation of them from the Church, beside that of ones self. Nay, every judicious person has a clear evidence, to gather from the precise words of your first enumeration of these acts, that you understood them all, either disjunctively or conjunctively, to make Diotrephes mortally a Schismaticque. For the now cited words of yours are capable in good construction onely of these two senses: that either you mean, in a disjunctive sense, that Diotrephes not receiving St. John, or denying him the Communion of that Church, was mortally a Schismaticque; and deny-



denying it to the Brethren, was mortally a Schismaticque; and by each of the two following acts, separately became mortally a Schismaticque; so that by every one of these acts apart, he was mortally a Schismaticque: or you must mean, that though every one of the said acts apart did not suffice to constitute him mortally a Schismaticque, yet all conjunctively and together did: both which senses are equally against your present effugium, of placing your Argument in the last act alone: For that clearly destroyes the construction of the words, and makes your Proposition evidently false, and clearly contradicts what you granted in a former answer, that you mentioned the first act as an instance of Diotrephes his Schisme, as we shall shew presently: As if one should say, Diotrephes stealing Peters goods, and bearing false witness against him in a suit at Law, and speaking ill of him behinde his back, and killing him with his own hands, and all this out of a spite against him, was mortally a murderer; intending to prove him mortally a murderer only by the last act of killing; what judicious person would not esteem him out of his wits, who should advance so illogicall a Proposition as this?

and



and yet yours is no better, if you understood Diotrephes no more to have become a Schismaticque in your sense, by any save the last act alone, then this is. And if you do understand him to have become a Schismaticque by them all, as most certainly you do, then those former acts must have been intended as reasons and instances to prove Diotrephes mortally a Schismaticque: (and by that to prove your intent) that being the first medium which you took to prove it.

P. 18.

Whereas therefore you require the precise words may be particularly specified, which signifie the difference; we specify particularly those, *An active separation beside that of ones self:* and say, those words do properly, expressly, and formally belong to the last act of Diotrephes, and not so to any of the former: and this difference any one may easily perceive, who would not purposely mistake. Wherefore we hope the Auditory will judge you had no just reason at first to presume, that we placed our Argument in the first act of Diotrephes, as well as the last. Much lesse can you have any pretense of reason still

to contend for it, after we have so often, and with so much reason denied it. And this we conceive sufficient as to your first objection.

## C. 18.

We demanded one thing, and you answer another, our demand was, to particularize in the precise words of the first proposall of your first Argument (which we expressed three or four times over, and yet you take no notice of it) which begins, for example, Diotrepes, &c. And you designe the words immediately precedent to that first proposall of this your Argument: which contains only your Minor, or Thesis, to be proved, and not the Argument to prove it. Whence appears, that our demand remains wholly unsatisfied; and so we hope every equall Reader will determine. Now that we demanded the specification of some words contained in the sole proposall of your Argument, is evident by our words: for we say expressly more then once, that no word in the first proposall of your Argument of Diotrepes makes any determination more of the last act, then of the precedent, and would gladly have the word designed that do it: and you neither have designed, nor  
can

can designe any one word in that whole proposall, which signifies any such matter. So that you have not satisfied our demand, seeing the words designed by you, shew not that you did, but that you ought to have placed your Argument in the last act alone.

## P. 19.

To your second, when you demand, to what these words, viz (and all this, &c.) are referred; we answer, to all the acts of *Diotrephes*; which did all proceed from that one originall desire of preheminance. But it doth not follow from thence, that we intended to make use of all those acts, to which that love of preheminance did belong: but onely that the love of preheminance did belong to that act, which we intended to make use of, (and of which alone, we could in that case make use) as well as to the rest. *Diotrephes* did all this, as loving to have the preheminance; and consequently did cast the Brethren out of the Church, as loving to have the preheminance.

## C. 19.

But to what end did you affirm, that the words, all this, &c. referred to all the precedent acts, if you intended not by that reference

ference to give strength to your Argument, by affirming, that all those precedent acts were infected with the spirit, and excesse of pride, and so schismaticall? and then seeing you extended that spirit to them all, is it not evident, that you either laboured to prove thereby, that all the precedent acts were schismaticall; or you extended it to them all to no purpose for your present advantage: As if one should say, Thomas cutting Paul in the head, and thrusting him through the body, and piercing him through the heart, (and all this as desirous to take his life from him) was mortally a murtherer; and then being demanded, what he meant by all this, should answer, That it referred to all the three acts, but yet he intended not to prove Thomas a murtherer, save onely by the last; would any man of judgement think that he spake sense? Neither will your saying, That by referring these words, *all this*, to all the acts, you proved, that the love of preheminance belonged to that act, which you intended to make use of. For to what purpose went you so far about to prove that, by such a generall induction, seeing you might have taken a short, direct,  
and

and distinct way to prove that, by saying thus, And casting them out of the Church, and that as loving to have the preheminnence. For who would not esteem it an absurd manner of arguing, if one, seeing three men before him, & intending only to affirm (as conducing to his present purpose) that Thomas, the last of them, was an honest man, should say thus, All these are honest men; thereby shewing, that if all, then Thomas is one; when he might have said without any more to do, Thomas is an honest man, and thereby spoken both directly and distinctly; as indeed had your meaning been what you say, you should have done: and not proved the love of preheminnence to belong to the last act; because it belonged to all; and by consequence the last being one of the number, it must belong to it; when you might have said as well, and more clearly, it belonged to the last act, without any such far fetched Argument to prove that, which was evident enough without it.

And therefore your great subtilty in distinguishing between (*All this as, &c.*) and (*in all this, &c.*) is no way materiall.

all. For when we say, *In all this, &c.* we professe to mean as much as can be understood by *all this* in the Nominative Case, as you call it. For if *all this* in our discourse be as you would have it, the Nominative Case; we desire you would finde a verb for it also, with which it might agree. For our parts we look upon it in another case, by an *Ellipsis*: *All this*, that is, doing all this; and then in *all this* hath the same sense.

C. 20.

*That you changed your own words, you do not, you cannot deny, (though you conceal it here, and call it our subtlety, when you should have given it its right name of your alteration) and that is alwayes unfair in a Disputant, and untrue too. For you affirm those to be your words which were not your words; and where the present question is about your words, it is of concern, even though no great change were made in the sense. Yet by your leave a great change in the sense is made by this your alteration of your own words. For whether you make all this the Nominative case, viz. all this was done by him (as we say) or the Accusative, doing all this (as*

E

you

you say) which imports nothing yet in both these senses, all this was done, or doing all this, as loving to have the preheminence, signifies that the original motive, which brought him to all these schismaticall acts, was inordinate love of preheminence, as you say in the next Paragraph, who out of affectation of preheminence, both himself, &c. But when you change it thus, and in all this loving to have the preheminence, the love of preheminence may be a concomitant or subsequent gust, which he took in enjoying a preheminence above others, not due to him, though moved to those acts by some other motive of hatred, v. gr. dislike, &c. As if one should say, John fed upon three dishes of meat, and all this as loving to please his pallat; it would signifie, that the motive inducing him to eat of those three dishes, was the love of pleasing his pallat. But if one change it thus, John fed upon three dishes of meat, in all this loving to please his pallat, it implies not necessarily, that the love of pleasing his pallat induced him to that act, but that he was induced by hunger or desire to sustain nature, but in eating loved the gust and sweetness; which he felt in those dishes, as a sub-



*subsequent, or concomitant affection, or gust in eating.*

P. 21.

Now if you cannot prove, as you have not, that in our first proposall of our Argument, we placed it in the first Act of *Diotrephes*, as well as in the last; surely you will be lesse able to prove, that we did so in the second proposall of it, where we expressly told you, we placed it in the last: which notwithstanding you equally endeavour to prove, but without all shew of probability. For reciting our words, *B. 5. you answer by asserting this, &c.* You say, *we labour to shew your assertion to be untrue, both from Diotrephes his not receiving St. John, &c. And also from his casting out the Brethren.* Whereas we laboured to shew your assertion false by the example of *Diotrephes*, who did not receive, and did cast out, but we laid our Argument, not in his not receiving, but in his casting out. And that we did so, is most evident: for in the same place we cited the last act in the originall Greek words, that they might be Authentique, which we did not in any of the other acts; and immediately after the citation of the Greek

Text, we subjoynd these words, *We ask now, was, or was not this act of Diotrephes, to wit, his casting those good Christians out of the Church, an act Schismaticall, or no?* In which words, we did not, as you say, insist principally, but totally in the last act: *was this, said we, a Schismaticall act or no?* We never askt the question of any other action of *Diotrephes*: we propounded our Argument by way of question; and therefore we propounded no other Argument, but what was contained in that question, we required an answer to this question onely; and therefore we placed our Argument in this question onely: and so it still remains inviolably true, which we so manifestly before proved, that we placed our Argument in the last act of *Diotrephes*, before we were advertised of of the preterition of your Answer.

## C. 22.

*In your second proposall it is manifest (and we leave it to any equal judgement) that your words signifie, that you placed your Argument in all the four acts: but there began to insist particularly upon the last: which you took to be the most clearly making for you. Your words before cited by us are these,*

these, *This* (your Adversaries assertion) we prove to be untrue. First, from the example of *Diotrephes*, who out of affectation of preheminance, both himself received not St. *John* his lawfull superiour, nor the Brethren, and forbad them who would receive them, and also cast them out of the Church. Why did you nominate here the three first acts? was it onely to fill paper? had you no intention of proof in it? or were they no proofs at all? to what purpose then did you mention them? Were there any that should affirm, that there is never a Traytour in such or such a Town, and another should say, I prove that to be untrue: First, by the example of *John*, who drinks himself drunk every day, steals all he can lay his hands on, and speaks ill of every one behinde their backs, and also has plotted a Treason against the Chief Magistrate, would he not be thought an argute Disputer, to bring so many impertinencies, when he might by the last onely have proved his intent, without loosing time and labour in mentioning the former. You must therefore either confesse, that you alledged those three first acts to no purpose (which we will not so much as suspect of you) or that you intend-

ed a proof against our assertion, and of your own in them. And yet you might insist particularly, and select the last, not as the sole, but as you thought the most pregnant proof against us; not disclaiming from them as no proofs, but waving the others as of lesse force: an ordinary practice among Disputants; yet so, that it is in the liberty and power of the Respondent, if he please to hold the Opponent to the making good all the other partiall instances, or reasons which he adduced to prove his Thesis. Neither will your evasion (used in a former answer) solve the difficulty, viz. that you alledged those precedent acts, to induce the Reader to the understanding the last act. For there was no need at all of any such induction, it being a thing so easie to be understood without them. For if you had said onely thus, As for example, Diotrephes casting the Brethren out of the Church for receiving St. John, the understanding must have been very flat, which would not have conceived it.

P. 23.

Whereas instead of making good your constant mistakes, you go about to finde some contradictions in our discourses, we doubt

doubt not, but your undertakings will prove as unfortunate in these, as in the former.

We said *not, receiving St. John was no excommunication, but the denying Communion of subordination to him*; which, said we, and you confest it, is no excommunication. This you would prove from our own words to be untrue: because when we had said, *denying him the Communion of that Church*, we presently added, *and denied it to the Brethren*, which signifies, that he denied the same Communion to Saint *John*, which he did to the Brethren; and the Communion denied to the Brethren was not that of subordination. To which we answer, That which Diotrefes denied, was the Communion of the Church; this Communion he denied both to Saint *John*, and to the Brethren respectively: but he denied the Communion to Saint *John*, which was due to St. *John*; and to the Brethren, that which was due to the Brethren: the one was the communion of subordination, the other was not; and yet both were the communion of that Church: and therefore it may very properly be said, He denied the com-

munion of that Church to St. *John*; and he denied it, that is, the communion of that Church, to the Brethren; though that communion, which he denied to St. *John*, were the communion of subordination; and that which he denied to the Brethren, were not.

## C. 23.

*Here you grant in expresse terms, that he denied the communion of that Church to St. John, which was due to St. John; hence I subsume, But the Communion due to St. John was not onely of subordination to him, as his Superiour, but also of participating with all those of that Church in Prayer, Sacraments, Christian Conversation, &c, as being no less a true member of Christs Church, then any other Christian: Therefore he denied both those communions to St. John: But the deniall of this second communion by the Bishop of a Church, is formall excommunication. Ergo, since he denied that Communion (by your confession) to St. John, which was due to him, he did, so much as in him lay, formally excommunicate him: and consequently by the word it denying it to the Brethren, you must mean, that he denied that very Communion*  
of

of the Church to St. John, which he denied to the Brethren; though withall he denied more to St. John, then to the Brethren, to wit, that of subordination also: Seeing therefore all Church-~~communion~~ in Prayer, Sacraments, &c. was as due to St. John, as to any other Christian; and Diotrophes denied by your confession here to St. John, that Church-~~communion~~ which was due to him, he must have denied him the said Communion; and prohibited all those of his Church to communicate in Prayer, Sacraments and civill conversation with him; and so, as much as was in his power, excommunicated him.

And here you answer not one word to another Argument, which we pressed against you, viz. That if you meant onely the Communion of Subordination by those words, denying to him the Communion of that Church, you endeavoured to prove a separation to be Schisme, beside that of ones self, by alledging a separation, which was a separation onely of ones self, and intended onely as such by you.

P. 24.

Again to our constant deniall, that we ever propounded any plurality of reasons,

E 5

you



you oppose our clear words, page 11. *where we term, say you, the particulars which our words contain, Acts or Reasons.* But how clearly these words were ours, or how we can be said to acknowledge a plurality of reasons brought by us, we desire the Reader to judge; who shall finde that in the same place, where these words, viz. *acts or reasons* are onely found, our single Argument as single, and sole reason as sole, is mainly urged. For when you called upon us to review our own words, we returned this Answer<sup>3</sup>, *You see we have reviewed them*, and plainly finde, you were admonished by our words (who brought the Argument) *to spare your pains in considering all those acts, or reasons; and to speak to what your Opponent urgeth you, viz. this act of his casting out, &c.* Where we speak not of any assignation of reasons brought by us, but of one onely act, urged as an argument by us; and of your consideration of those acts or reasons, because you onely would consider them as *acts and reasons.*

C. 24.

*How much soever you insisted in your last reason, when you perceived by our answer, that*

that the first act was insufficient, yet you say plainly, that the three former acts were acts or reasons; and those not ours, for we meddled with none but the first; and you call the first presently after, your reason; saying to us, How could you fear that we would have that our reason to be thought unanswered, &c. And though you presently add these words, And that former was mentioned by us, not as our reason of the inference of the conclusion, but as an instance of Diotrephes his Schisme, wherein we knew you would agree with us, &c. Yet even here you acknowledge, that you brought it as an instance (and every instance is a reason) of Diotrephes his schism. And it seems very strange to us, that any persons of reason, who brought that example of Diotrephes to prove something to be Schisme, which is an active separation beside that of ones self, should use instances in proving the Schism of Diotrephes, which are separations of ones self. And your arguing in this manner is much like to this: If one should maintain, that a man becomes drunk by drinking something, which is neither wine nor strong waters; and in proof of this should argue thus, John by drinking Sack,

Sack, and Claret, and strong Waters, and Ale, is often drunk; should he not have said in any Logicians judgement, John, for example, is often drunk by drinking Ale; Therefore a man becomes drunk by something, which is neither Wine nor strong Waters. To what purpose then were the instances of Sack and Claret brought? which were not onely not in question, but wholly impertinent, to infer the conclusion. But certainly you brought those instances to prove Diotrophes a Schismaticque to some purpose: (for we will not entertain any other opinion of you) Therefore you must have brought them as Instances of Diotrophes his becoming a schismaticque by acts, containing an Active separation from the Church, beside that of ones self: and consequently in your first proposall, you really esteemed all those acts to be such, as both appears by your words, (as we have now shewed) and all Logicall and rationall proceeding required.

P. 25.

In the same manner you say, We stile the first act, whereto you answered the originall reason, which made Diotrophes a Schismaticque. Whereas it was you that stiled it so, and not we, any otherwise, then by repeating

repeating of your words: which your words were these, *We did not without cause term our answer to your first reason, the main substance of our answer, and the thing wholly important; for that was the originall reason, which made Diotrephes a Schismaticque.* Thus you. To which we answered in this manner, *If that were in your judgement the originall reason, which made Diotrephes a Schismaticque, &c.* We said not, that it was the originall reason, we exprest not our own judgement: nay, we allowed not at all your judgement, but onely said thus much, *That if in your judgement it were the originall reason, yet as our Argument was framed, it could be no reason at all.* We desire you therefore hereafter, when you read our discourses, you will distinguish your own words from ours: otherwise it will be easie for you to find contradictions in our Replies: for we have not usually occasion to repeat your words, but on the purpose to contradict and refute them; which we would be glad you would do to us: speak *ad oppositum*, and let your conclusion contradict our proposition, without so frequent an *Ignoratio Elenchi*.

## C. 25.

*You say very untruly, when you affirme, that you expressed not your judgement in that place, as conformable to ours; and more, in saying, You allowed not at all of our judgement; and yet most of all, in affirming, That as your Argument was framed, it could be no reason at all. Your words, speaking to us, are these: If that were in your judgement the principall reason, which made Diotrephes a Schismaticque, 'twas not the principall instance of your Opponents, on which they professed their inference to depend, &c. Where you both acknowledge it, not to be the principall instance, and so to be an instance; (and every instance brought to prove any thing is a reason) for it would be absurd to say of any one, He is not the principal Magistrate, if he be no Magistrate at all: And hence appears, how untruly you affirm, That this first act was held by you to be no reason at all: neither disallowed you our judgement, that it was the originall reason, which made Diotrephes a Schismaticque; which was all that we said, as our words here cited by you testifie. For immediately before, you said, That the former*

mer, that is the first act, was mentioned by you, as one instance (that is one reason) of Diotrephes his Schisme. Now if it were one, as you here confesse, you must needs allow it to be the original reason of it; both because it is put in the first place, and because all the following acts were performed in reference to that. For Diotrephes both received not the Brethren, and forbad those who received them; and cast them out of the Church; because (even as you confess) they lived in Catholique Communion with Saint John, and would not reject him, as Diotrephes had done. And hence appears also how untrue it is, that you exprest not your own judgement: for you exprest it sufficiently, both by granting that the first act was used by you as an instance of Diotrephes his Schisme, and that it was an instance, on which you professed your inference to depend, though not the principal; and that reciting our words, viz. if that were in your judgement the originall Reason, which made Diotrephes a Schismaticque: You adjoyn no deniall of it, (by saying v. gr. we deny, or some such like disallowance of our judgement) and do tacitly admit of it, but deny onely that it was the principall instance

instance of your inference, which was not contrary to what we said there: for it might well be the originall reason of Diotrephes his Schisme, as we said it was, and yet not (at least in your judgement) the principall instance of your inference, as you said it was not. Now it is strange to see, to what waverings and inconstancies, straits have brought you in this particular, about this first act of Diotrephes. First, you say, It was no reason of yours, but a reason brought by us. Secondly, that it was mentioned by you, as an instance, (that is a reason) of Diotrephes his Schisme: presently after, that it was an instance, though not the principall, on which you professed your inference to depend. After this, that it was no reason of Diotrephes his Schisme. And lastly, that it was no reason at all, as you say here. In your former answer you say, That it was an instance agreed on both parts; in your next Reply, that it was produced by you onely as antecedent and necessary to lead us to the following words, &c. and so no instance of Diotrephes his Schisme. Thus you play fast and loose, off and on, say and unsay, as occasion serves; because

Truth



Truth is so strong against you, that you know not what to say; and yet something you will say, rather then yield to it. You needed not therefore to admonish us of attending better to your discourses: for you see we have sifted them more narrowly, then you your selves have done: and we hope, we shall not be found guilty of citing your words otherwise, then you have writ them; as you cannot deny, that you have miscited your own.

## P. 26.

Thus having duly considered all which you have brought to force us to an acknowledgement of a multiplicity of reasons in the example of *Diotrephes*, that thereby you might seem to have refuted something; we finde, that as we never insisted upon any one act of *Diotrephes*, as an Argument to prove our intent, viz. That some Active separation, beside of ones self, is scismaticall; so we have proved the same by Arguments never yet answered, and have cleared the same from whatsoever hath been objected.

## C. 26.

We must give you leave to speak, how well you have proved that there was one sole reason

reason in the first proposall of your Argument, before you received our Answer to it, (for this is the thing which we chiefly now object against you) we hope by this ha's so openly appeared, that no more is needfull to evidence it. The result therefore of this your Reply, even to this last justification of your selves, is thus much: First you said, your reasons were not answered, when your own words cited by us, had overthrown their ground, and so abstracted all force from them. Secondly, you account no man judicious, who judges, that you used any reason to confirme your Thesis, but what was of force to confirme it. Thirdly, we demand that you shew, by particularizing some words in the first proposall of your Argument, which shew, that you placed it in the last act of Diotrephes alone, and in none of the former; and for answer you bring the words of your Thesis, which was to be proved, and not the words in the proposall of your Argument, which you brought to prove that Thesis. Fourthly, we demand to what your words, All this, &c. are referred; whether to one alone, or to all the precedent acts? You answer to all; and if to all, say we, (which we intended to prove) why

why are they so referred, but to shew, that Diotrephes was rendred mortally a Schismatic by them all? and if a Schismatic by them all, then you made use of all the said acts to prove it; and by that medium, of his being mortally a Schismatic by those acts, to prove your Thesis. Fifthly, you shew that, mediately by a generall proposition, which all Logick required to have been shewed by it self solely, and immediately. Sixthly, you say, that Diotrephes denied to St. John the Communion of that Church, which was due to him; and yet you deny that he deprived him of that Communion, (of participating in Prayer, Sacraments, and Christian conversation) of which he deprived the Brethren; and yet that very Communion was due to him. Seventhly, you deny flatly here, that the first act of Diotrephes is any reason at all brought by you; and yet you acknowledge before, that it was mentioned by you as an instance, (that is, a reason) of Diotrephes his Schisme: and his Schisme was the medium, which you first took to prove your Thesis. Eighthly, you bring at last an act to prove your Thesis, which proves it not: your Thesis was this, Some active separation,

tion, beside that of ones self is Schisme : the act which you pitch upon to prove this, is Diotrephes casting others out of the church, for keeping due Catholique Communion. Now this addition for keeping due Catholique Communion, renders that casting others out of the Church to be an active separation, which is a separation of ones self; and consequently not onely proves not your Thesis, that there is some active separation, beside that of ones self, which is Schism; but proves the quite contrary, if it prove any thing. Now that such a separation, for keeping due Catholique Communion, is a separation of ones self, we have made manifest: for it is an externall exercise of hatred and rejection of Catholique Communion, which cannot but be a separation of ones self from that Communion. Ninthly, our answer to the first act of Diotrephes, whereby he first became a Schismaticke, by separating himself from the Church, and which made all the subsequent acts schismaticall, and participant of separation as the formall motive of them, (for they were all done in order to that) remains to this very hour, not onely unanswered, but untouched; though you have been so often

often admonished by us of that preterition. And though you say in a former Reply, that the not receiving St. John might have been a reason, and yet not hinder, that your last act may be a reason too; if you mean (as you must, if you will prove any thing) that it could be a reason too, that is such a reason, as includes an Active separation beside that of ones self; we say, if ours was a reason, that could not be a reason too: for it having been done by Diotrephes in reference to the first act, and onely for this reason, that they received St. John, he cast them out of the Church; seeing that first reason includes a separation of ones self, your last act of casting out could not be a reason including an Active separation beside that of ones self. Tenthly, to our answer to the last act of Diotrephes, how it was schismaticall, you have not yet said one word; viz. That as the act of speaking against St. John, was in it self tending towards Schism; so likewise were the subsequent acts of not receiving the Brethren, and casting them out of the Church, because they communicated with Saint John, schismaticall act in themselves, abstracting from the precedent

cedent Schisme of him that did them: not because it was onely an unjust ejection out of that Church, but because it contained in it a contempt and disobedience against the lawfull Apostolicall Pastour of that Church; and by consequence a reiterating an active voluntary separation of Diotrephes from St. John, and by him from the whole Church, *ut supra.* Thus we. Which shew evidently, that this new act, on which you so much insist, is not an active separation, beside that of ones self, but an active separation of ones self, and as such onely Schismaticall. And now glory as much as you please, that you have proved your intent by Arguments never yet answered, and have cleared the same from whatsoever hath been objected. But withall you will please to give leave to the \* Auditors, to determine whether this your glory be vain, or no.

## SECT. 3.

*That casting others unjustly out of the Church for this sole reason, That they keep due Catholique Communion, is so far from disproving the definition given by the Catholique Defendants, that it confirms theirs, and proves not the Definition of the Protestant Opponents.*

## C. 26.

**W**Hich supposed, we go forward to your last reason, so much pressed by you about casting Christians out of the Church, which received St. *John*. To this we answered punctually, as you demanded, *that it was Schismaticall*; and gave two reasons, each sufficient for the Schismaticallness of it, as you acknowledge. To your so much pressing us to answer to your reason, and complaining that we answered not directly to it, viz. *That Diotrephes cast those Christians out of the Church for no other reason, then for keeping due Catholique Communion*, we reply, that we conceived those words to say no more, then as related to your definition, that he cast them out of the Church  
cause-



causelessly and unjustly: seeing that the keeping due Catholique Communion can be no just cause of excommunication, or casting out of the Church: as when a good subject or servant is wrongfully cast out of his natural Countrey, or Masters service, such as know their innocency use to say, they were cast out for being good members of the Commonwealth, or servants in their families, that is, without any just cause at all. And if we had conceived, that you had meant by that expression any more then this, we would have rendered you a further answer. But now perceiving by your often pressing reiterations of that reason, that you spake not onely in the premised negative manner, but meant it positively, *viz.* That the formall reason of their casting out those persons was, onely because they kept due Catholique Communion, that is, *reduplicativè*, and reflexively for that sole reason, we return you this reply. First, that we had no reason to imagine that you intended any sense of those your words, which is destructive of it self, as that is, which we prove thus: Because it is impossible that any one should become

a formall Schismaticque by such an act, as that pretended by you would be : seeing such an act supposes him to be a formall Schismaticque , at least *animo*, in will and affection : and either accidently puts it in externall execution , as many other acts may do, which are done for the same end: as if one should suspend or interdict others , solely because they keep Catholique Communion ; which notwithstanding you neither put in your definition, nor blame ours , because it wants them ; or augments his Schisme , if it be already contracted by any former exteriour act, as this of *Diotrephes* was. For it cannot be conceived , that any one can cast another out of the Church, for this sole, positive and formal reason, because he keeps due Catholique Communion, if he be not presupposed a contemner, hater, and relinquisher of due Catholique Communion himself. For so long as this Caster out is supposed to be in Catholique Communion himself, and a lover and maintainer of it ; how can he cast out another solely for continuing and maintaining that Communion, unlesse he be supposed to maintain and destroy , to love and hate , to

98 *The nullity of the first Argument.*

esteem and contemne, to accept and reject the same thing, at the same time. And hence follows evidently, that the formall reason, which makes this Caster out a Schismaticke, is not an actuall casting others without sufficient cause or authority out of the Church, as you say in your definition of Schisme (which you are obliged neither to destroy, nor alter in the progresse of your discourse, unlesse you disallow of your own definition) but the sole formall cause of Schisme in this act, is the contempt and rejection of Catholique Communion, which might accidentally have been executed in other material acts not separating others from the Church, as well as by that. Neither therefore is our definition to be reputed *lame*, and yours *perfect*, as you repute them, by the want or addition respectively of those terms; unlesse you esteem the want or addition of an hundred other acts, which are not separative of others from the Church, and yet may be done for the same reason, for which you say this separation of others by *Diotrephes* was done, that is, *Safely for keeping the Catholique Communion*, which you have  
not

not added; and if you had, you would have made a monster of a definition. Either therefore acknowledge your definition *lame*, for not particularizing all those other unseparating acts, which done for *this sole reason* will be *materially* as Schismaticall, as this of *Diotrephes*: or that ours is *not lame*, for not particularizing the said separation of others from the Church. And hence we maintain without any difficulty, what we said, and you object against us, *That there is no active separation, save that of ones self from the whole Church, which can properly be tearmed Schisme.* For seeing we dealt with Logicians and Philosophers, we supposed that they would understand our words according to the rules of Logick and Philosophy, that is, in a formall sense, and *quatenus tale*, as such an active unjust separation of others is *formally* an unjust separation of others, and under that *sole formality*: As if one Philosopher should say to another, *no peice of wood can be tearmed properly an image*, he were to be understood in *sensu formali*, that is, onely in so much as it is a peice of wood, or under that *sole formality*: or if you should have said to

100 *The nullity of the first Argument.*

us, no unjust suspension, or interdict of others, can properly be tearmed Schisme, seeing they contain no active separation of our selves, or others from the visible Church of Christ, which you esteem necessary to constitute Schisme, as appears by your definition, we would presently have understood you in a formall sense, that is, as they are unjust suspensions, or interdicts, and no further.

Now in this formall sense, usuall and obvious among Philosophers, our proposition is most true. For no active unjust separation of others from the Church, standing in the sole formality, or intrinsecall notion of such an active separation, can properly be tearmed Schisme; no more then a peice of wood can be properly tearmed an image, or an unjust suspension, &c. under the sole notion of unjust suspension, can be tearmed properly Schisme. When therefore any unjust suspension, interdict, or excommunication of others are denominated Schisme, or formally Schismaticall; it proceeds not from any formality comprised within their essential notions, but from the adjunction of some other extrinsecall and accidentall formality;

lity, which formally constitutes them in the notion of Schisme; no otherwise, then the adjunction of some artificiall figure to a peice of wood, constitutes it formally under the notion, or denomination of an image. As therefore, though by reason of this adjunction, some piece of wood may be truly termed an image, yet it would be impertinent to put these termes of *wood* into the definition of an image; so though by the like adjunction of some accidentall formality, some unjust suspension, interdict, or excommunication of others may be truly tearmed Schisme, it would be as little pertinent, to put *unjust suspension interdict, or excommunication of others* into the definition of Schisme. And here your Sophism is clearly detected, when you say, that if we acknowledge, that some unjust active separation of others from the Church, is or may be Schisme, then both our definition and assertion is overthrowen. For we answer most easily, that if we confesse, that such a separation be Schisme, by any formality which is essentiall to the notion of unjust separation of others (which we never acknowledged, nor ever shall acknowledge)

F 3

ledge)

ledge) I grant your consequence : if it become Schisme, or Schismaticall by some other externall adjunct, *ut supra*, we deny it? And seeing this said externall formality hath neither yet been proved, nor can possibly be conceived to be any other, then what we have put in our definition, *viz.* some reason involving a voluntary separation of our selves from the whole true visible Church of Christ, it serves for a most strong confirmation of the perfection of our definition.

## P. 27.

*From this you passe to our last reason, as you call it, which is the sole reason in the case of Diotrophes, which as yet we ever urged, and tell us, that you gave two reasons for the Schismaticalnesse of that act of Diotrophes, and acknowledged the act to be Schismaticall for these two reasons, whereas the question was propounded to you under another reason : and therefore your liberall giving (who were the Respondents) of those two reasons, was no punctuall answer to our question. Where we adverteise you likewise, that that demand of ours of an answer to our question, was not with any reference to the justification, or explication of our own*  
desi.



definition, but to the impugning of yours, which onely was in debate: and so our Question contained our Argument against you, and should have been punctually answered. But you say, you would have rendred a further Answer, if you had conceived our meaning: and now you understand our meaning, That the formall reason of the casting out, was onely for keeping due Catholique Communion, you tell us first (without a second) it is impossible that any one should become a formall Schismaticque for such an act. By which words, if you mean to oppose our sense, you ought to have observed, that the Question to which your punctuall Answer was required, was this; Was, or was not this act of Diotrephes, viz. his casting those good Christians, lively members of Christs body, out of the Church, and that for no other cause, but for keeping due Catholique Communion, an act Schismaticall? A punctuall Answer to this hath been oft called for, and now at last you give us for your Answer, That these words are destructive of themselves, because it is impossible, that any one should become a formall Schismaticque by such an act, since he must be presupposed to

F-4

have

104 *The nullity of the first Argument.*

have been one before. First, we shew this is not *ad oppositum*; and so nothing yet of punctuall answer now at last. For this act so much urged upon you, may have been done for no other cause, but for their keeping due Catholique Communion, as we say; and may have been done by one presupposed to have been a formall Schismaticque, as you say; and yet still this act be an act formally Schismaticall, though done onely for that cause; (which is all we need to say, or to have granted us by you :) And when afterwards we speak of some ones first becomming a Schismaticque, then our words were these, That he who separates others unjustly from the Churches Communion, doth thereby indeed (if not separate before) consequently separate himself from the Church. Those words of ours, if not separated before, might have saved you a great part of the needless trouble of this Reply.

Your reason, why you charge our words to be untrue and impossible to be true, is, because such an act supposes him to be a formall Schismaticque, at least animo, in will and affection: which reason of  
yours

*The nullity of the first Argument.* 105

yours supposes necessarily, that no man can do an act formally Schismaticall, which is a formall Schismaticque before; then which nothing can be more irrationall: As if a formall Heretique might not afterwards truly elicit, and do acts formally Hereticall; or a person formally Seditious may not afterwards elicit, and do acts formally Seditious; or a formall Habitual Drunkard may not afterward commit a formall act of Ebriety. But you give a reason of your reason, because it cannot be conceived, that any one can cast another out of the Church for this sole positive and formall reason, if he be not presupposed to be a contemner, hater, and relinquisher of due Catholique Communion himself. But what if he be so presupposed? we have already shewed, that neither hurts nor answers us. And secondly we now come to examine the truth of these your Assertions, and say, that by such an act done upon so unjust a cause, as for keeping due Catholique Communion, some one may possibly become a formall Schismaticque (whether Diotrephes case were such or no) whereas your Assertion is, that it is impossible any one can:

106 The nullity of the first Argument.

which you cannot persist to defend, if you consider, that any person, first, having hatred in his heart towards a company of his Christian Brethren, and being devoid of the internall love of God, and Christ, and his Church, and filled also with boldnesse and arrogance of pride, may yet have elicited no act internall nor externall of formall Schisme, though he be in the highest and next disposition thereto; and then may proceed, being pricked on by hatred and pride, to a resolution internall, commanding an externall execution of casting out such his Brethren, and that upon so unjust a cause, as for keeping due Catholique Communion; which he being before proud, as we said, now begins to contemne, that his hatred may execute revenge, and thereby becomes a formall Schismaticke. And doth not, we pray, that Text of St. John mean so much? They went out from us, but they were not of us: for if they had been of us, they would, no doubt, have continued with us, 1 John 2. 19. They went out from us; there is their first formall act of Schism: But before this, St. John supposes they were not of us, they were not internally joyned with us by Faith, nor by Love,

*The nullity of the first Argument.* 107

Love, or else no doubt they would have continued with us. For it being impossible, that any should go out from the Church by Schisme, who had in their hearts Faith working by Love; yet it was possible (it seemed to us in their case also reall, and to have been St. Johns meaning) that they should neither love God, nor Christ, nor his Church, before they went, or resolved to go out from them by formall Schisme, or had elicited or done any other act of formall Schisme.

Now as to the reason you alledge, if it were true to that intent to which you alledge it, it would overthrow your own Definition, for the defence of which you brought it: A precedent contempt of Catholique Communion being as necessary (if necessary to be precedent) to that act which your definition makes formally schismaticall; that is, the separation of ones self from the whole Church, as to the act which you oppose in ours: For it is as true, that none can so separate himself voluntarily from the whole Church, but he which is a contemner of all Catholique Communion; as it is, that no man can without such contempt cast out another, for that cause of keeping due Catholique

*lique Communion.* Nay, this precedent contempt is more necessary in him, that voluntarily separates himself from the whole Church, then in him who separateth another, for that onely unjust cause of keeping due Catholike communion: for the latter may yet desire to keep Communion with the Church himself (though he envy it to another) which the former cannot, supposing he willfully separates himself.

As for your objection in relation to our definition it is improper, whiles yet the question before our hands, and our Argument, and your Answers are onely about your definition, as by your selves explained, whether it be yet tolerable as a definition, or even a good and convertible description (for we would not be nice with you, we told you.) Now for you desultorily to remove this cause from triall and issue, by falling to recriminating of ours, is fallacious, viz. Ignoratio Elenchi, and as yet unseasonable: when ours comes to be impugned, we shall not destroy it, nor alter it, but defend it (though we have just right of explaining it, which you have first, without our complaint, taken to your selves in yours.

To your often objecting to us the case of Suspensions and Interdicts, we once give you to understand, that an unjust Interdict, for example, of whole Nations sometimes from the exercise of those acts, wherein an eminent part at least of Ecclesiasticall externall Communion consists, if inflicted (as this ejection by Diotrophes was) for this onely unjust cause, viz. for their keeping due Catholique Communion, is truly Schismaticall; and so also an unjust Suspension of Officers of the Church: For example, Bishops, and Priests from the execution of their office, wherein an eminent part at least of Ecclesiasticall externall Communion is exercised, if inflicted (as this ejection by Diotrophes was) for this onely unjust cause, viz. for their keeping due Catholique Communion, is truly Schismaticall: and though we blame you not for not naming them in your definition, nor therefore name them in ours, yet we blame your defending such a definition as adequate, under which these are not contained, and by which these are wholly excused from schism, as such: and we averre, that if they be brought to the triall by ours, they will  
be



# 110 The nullity of the first Argument.

be found condemned of Schisme by our definition, as by their own merit and guilt they ought to be, and all that would defend them from it. For being in our supposition an unjust interdicting or suspending others, and that for keeping due Catholique Communion, they are at least a causelesse thrusting, or forcing others (what in them lies, who sentence them) from the due and bounden exercise of that, which is an eminent part of the exercise of Ecclesiasticall externall Communion. But if you put any confidence in that thin and slight fallacy, that in unjust casting out, or interdict, or suspension of others, solely for keeping due Catholique Communion, they would be guilty, at least animo, in will and affection, before they put it accidentally into externall execution; you must then be told, that you, who speak as Philosophers, should advert, That a Morall action includes together the internall and externall act; and so in 3. of John 9. ἐν τῇ ἐκκαθίστα ἐμβαλλει includes, we conceive, both the elicite and imperate act of Diotrephes's will; that is, both the minde, command, and the externall execution of casting out the Brethren, as appears in those words of the holy Text,  
And

*The nullity of the first Argument.* III

And not content therewith, &c. he casteth them out of the Church: and it were too puerile a dispute to controvert here, whether the Calumniatour or Murtherer, be formally such, by his will and intent to calumniate or murther, or by the externall calumniating or murthering, whereas 'tis manifest they are such formally by both; and he that accuses the externall act, alwayes is understood therein together to accuse the internall guilt of the will. So then, say we, the confessedly unjust Ejectour of his Brethren out of the Church-communication, when solely for their maintaining Catholique communion, in that act (as a Morall act is wont to be taken concretely, including the Will effecting or endeavouring the externall act) must not be supposed by you, is not supposed by us in sensu composito, to be then a lover and maintainer of Catholique communion; but by and in that very act, is formally schismaticall. Nor doth he at that time maintain and destroy, love and hate, esteem and contemn, accept and reject, as you object; but (which you might easily have discovered your selves to be our meaning) doth, so far as that act, elicits and imporate of his will is

## 112 The nullity of the first Argument.

considered, solely destroy, hate, contemne Catholique Communion; and therefore the contrary followes evidently, that such actuell casting out others for such unjust cause mentioned, viz. for their keeping of due Catholique Communion, is a formall reason why they are schismaticall. This act of casting out (as it includes the act of the Will, and otherwise it were not a moral action) the Brethren out of the Church for this unjust cause, is it self a manifest violation and contempt of Catholique Communion, in that which was his part to maintain, and to have conserved (as our definition suggested, in that which every part ought to supply.) For he, who being in Authority, or pretending to be, violates the bond of Catholique Communion, which he in his place (whereto he pretends) is especially set to conserve, maintain, and defend in himself, and in others; by casting others unjustly out for this unjust cause, for keeping due Catholique Communion, is in that act, as such, formally a contemner and violater of Catholique Communion, and formally schismaticall, and you will never be able to quit him of it: And therefore your definition (wherein  
you

you professe not to include such acts as such) is lame and partiall, and too much a friend to Schisme, even when you declaime against it; and ours, so much as it condemnes them, so much the perfecter: In which we rightly judged it needless, to name an hundred other acts, if reduced to this thrusting, or forcing, what in us lies, others from any bounden due part of Ecclesiasticall externall Communion, because comprehended in what we have said in it sufficiently.

C. 28.

Your Reply to our Answer, to the casting out of the Brethren for keeping due Catholique communion, is grounded in a misconceiving our words and meaning; when we affirmed, *That such an act as that, which you there propounded in proof of your Assertion, was destructive of it self.* For you, in your last Reply, take such an act absolutely in it self, and without any reference to your Assertion, in proof whereof you brought it, viz. *That there is some Active separation from the Church, beside that of ones self, which is*  
pro-

114 *The nullity of the first Argument.*

*properly Schisme*: And you abstract the said act from being a proof brought by you of the said Assertion; and proceed in your Reply upon this misconception. Now we, as being to answer your reason, and so to take this act as you take it in your Objection, that is, in reference onely to the proof of your fore-named Assertion, take it not absolutely as it is or may be considered in it self, but onely in the said relation to the proof of this, *That there is some Active separation from the Church, beside that of ones self, which is properly Schisme.* Now in this relative acception, this act of *Diatrephe*s, casting others out of the Church for this sole reason, of keeping due *Catholique Communion*, must be supposed (to prove your intent) to be an active separation from the Church, *beside that of ones self.* That therefore which we say is, that if this act be (as it must be, to serve your purpose) supposed to be an active separation from the Church, and not of ones self, it is an act destructive of it self: and therefore we say, that it is impossible, that any one should become a formall Schismatic by such an act, as that pretended by  
you

*you would be.* Now the act pretended by you must be an active separation from the Church, *which is not an active separation of ones self.* And our reason is, because before there be any active separation of others, solely for keeping Catholique Communion, the unjust separatour must be supposed to be a Schismaticque, either *animo*, in will and affection, or *exercitio*, by some other externall precedent act, which essentially is, or includes a separation of himself from the visible Church. And so that act of such an unjust separation, meerly for keeping Catholique Communion, will be, if your affirmation subst, an active separation, and *not of ones self*; and yet will either be, or presuppose an active separation of *ones self*; by reason of which contradictory predicates, it will plainly destroy it self. For we say, *So long as this Caster out is supposed to be in Catholique Communion himself, and a lover and maintainer of it, (as you must suppose him to be, so long as he separates not himself, neither interne nor externe from the said Communion) how can he cast out another solely for maintaining and continuing that Communion, &c.* This act

116 *The nullity of the first Argument.*

act therefore must either be no proof at all of your assertion, (which were wholly to evacuate your Argument) or it must be destructive of it self; which is our Argument against it. The force whereof is this, that seeing he, who casts another out of the Church, meerly for keeping due Catholique Communion, is made a formall Schismaticque, either internally, by the internall, or externally, by the externall rejection of Catholique Communion, and separation of himself from the Church, which is the predicate of our definition; and consequently his separation of another for that sole reason, did not that reason include (as you suppose it does not) essentially a Separation of himself, would never make him a Schismaticque.

This act therefore of separating others for keeping due Catholique Communion, put by you to be Schisme, as it is not of *ones self*, but of *others*, is plainly destructive of it self; seeing it becomes Schisme precisely, as it is an active separation of *ones self*, before it be considered as a separation of others. And hence appears the Non-consequence of what you say of precedent



*The nullity of the first Argument.* '117

cedent and consequent acts of Heresie, Sedition, Ebriety, Schisme, &c. For here you consider the acts of Schisme, and of the rest absolutely, and without relation to prove any assertion, which may intangle them in the like contradictions, as here your act is intangled by being a proof of yours. And for the acts of schism we have already asserted such precedent and consequent acts in the very instance of *Diotrephes*. And as little consequent is what you say of the same Argument with ours against you, to have force against the internall act of separation of our selves: for we put our definitions, and the acts both internal and external belonging to it, independently and absolutely, without any proof of other propositions, which may produce any jarring in them. Your proving, that a proud and unchristian Prelate may become a Schismaticque by excommunicating another solely for keeping due Catholique Communion, hurts us not; for you should have proved (in correspondence to your Argument) that such an unjust Prelate may become a Schismaticque by such an act, *as it is an active separation of another, and not of himself,*

*self*, which you have not done.

Your comprehending unjust suspensions and interdicts, (and the like is, of unjust penances, corporall punishments, and an hundred other unjust acts, which may be exercised upon inferiour Christians, for keeping due Catholique Communion) within your definition, seems first to make your definition of a monstrous extent. For whatsoever may be said of suspensions and interdicts (which we will presently treat) yet certainly penances, as fastings, watchings, prayings, alms-deeds, &c. unjustly inflicted for keeping due Catholique Communion, cannot be contained under any part of your definition: seeing they contain no violation of Catholique Communion, or the benefit of it: And the like is of corporall punishments unjustly inflicted, for keeping due Catholique Communion. These therefore, seeing they would in this case be acts as truly Schismaticall, as yours of unjust separation of others is, expressed in your definition, were to have been expressed in it; and the like is of an hundred other like acts, which in themselves alone have no violation of Church-Communion: Either

ther therefore your definition is imperfect for want of them, or not perfected for having the other of unjust Separation.

Concerning unjust suspensions and interdicts, though they come not directly within your definition; seeing they are no voluntary separations, neither of our selves or others from the Church; and therefore your definition is lame (by your own objection against ours) for want of them; yet because they may be comprehended within the formall reason of Schisme, as benefits of externall Communion, we will deferre the treating of them to our answer to that formality.

P. 28.

*The next part of your Reply, is an endeavour to rectifie our conceptions, pretending we have misconceived your words and meaning; when you said, That to make the casting out of the Brethren, for keeping due Catholique Communion a Schismaticall Act, is destructive of it self. And our mistake you say was this, that we took that act absolutely in it self, and not in reference to our assertion: To which we answer, that our Conceptions needed no such recti-*

120 *The nullity of the first Argument.*

*rectification: For we have proved such an act not to be destructive of it self, whether it be considered absolutely in it self, or whether it be considered in reference to our assertion.*

C. 29.

To what purpose took you the pains to prove it not to be destructive of it self, being considered absolutely in it self, when your Respondents never said it was so? Is not this called *labour in vain*? And by this do you not acknowledge thereby your misconceiving the sense, wherein we spake? Whilest you confesse, that you proceeded in a consideration of that act *absolutely*, which neither you nor we before had treated, but onely as related to the proof of your assertion: how then can you with truth say here, that your conceptions need no such rectification, when you your selves acknowledge here they were amisse?

P. 29.

*For that very Argument, which you raised from the reference of our assertion, we have already answered, which we could not have done, except we had considered that act together with that reference. For*  
the

the whole force of your argument is this, that the casting of the Brethren out of the Church for keeping due Catholique communion, cannot make a man a Schismaticque, as schisme is taken for the separation of another, and not of himself; because whosoever casts out the Brethren for that cause, must be supposed to separate himself, and so becomes a Schismaticque by your definition. But we have already shewed, that a man may cast out another out of the Church, from which he doth not actively and voluntarily separate himself. Therefore we gave an answer to your discourse, taking the act in reference to our assertion. Neither is there any thing in all this long observation of yours, which hath not received due consideration and satisfaction.

C. 30.

But withall you say, that you proved it not to be destructive of it self, considered in reference to your assertion. Where, or when proved you that? If in some other place, how can that excuse you from taking it without that reference absolutely and independently here, with which onely we charged you in this passage. It were a strange kind of answering, that when an

122 *The nullity of the first Argument.*

Opponent had proved that *Aristotle* takes quantity absolutely, without any reference to a naturall body, *in his Categories*, the Respondent should answer, that he takes it with reference to a naturall body *in his Physicks*. The present question therefore is this, whether you took not that act absolutely in it self, and without the reference of proving your assertion, in that place, wherein we charge you to have done so: and it is most evident that you did so: For the instances that you brought of an Heretique, a seditious Person, a proud Prelate, a Drunkard, &c. who after they are become guilty of those crimes, may perform acts formally participating of the said vices. And the same is, when you instance in our definition, that one may elicit an internall act of separating from the Church, before he separates externally) are manifestly taken by you in an absolute sense, without a relation to the proof of any assertion; and therefore you must either have taken this act absolutely, without all reference to the proving your assertion here, or you must have brought these examples to no purpose; nay, quite from your purpose,

pose, which we will not in the least suspect of you. Yet here we cannot let slip a misapplication of your answer to our objection. For all those your instances tend to prove, either that one may commit a formall act of a vice, after he is fallen into it by precedent acts; or that he may have internall acts of some vice, before he fall into any external; or that he may exercise both an internall and an external act together, without having before produced any formall, internall, or external act of that vice, though he had some internall dispositions to it before; as you say it may happen in the Prelate by you specified. Now all these examples suppose a diversity of precedent or subsequent acts, when we speak of one and the same formall act; affirming that this very act of *Excommunicating any one for this sole reason, because he keeps due Catholique Communion*, supposes him to be constituted a formall Schismaticque by a separation of himself from the Church, before he be supposed to separate others from the Church: not that he is thus supposed to separate by any precedent act of hatred, contempt, &c. of due Catholique Com-



124 *The nullity of the first Argument.*

munion, but that this very act contains within it self that contempt, according to the different formalities which are in it. So that though, as you here suppose the first Schismaticall act of that Prelate should be the casting out of his Brethren, for this sole reason, of *keeping due Catholique Communion*, he would become a formall Schismatic by that very act, in so much as it contains a *rejection of Catholique Communion*; and because it contains that malice separates others unjustly from the Church. Insomuch that this precedence is neither of time, nor of nature, but it is *prioritas rationis*, as it is termed in the Schools. And hence is both your misconception discovered, and your Argument solved. For seeing the keeping due Catholique Communion is the sole and totall formall motive contained in this act, which induces him to separate others from the Church, he must necessarily in this very act *reject* and *renounce* due Catholique Communion; and so if this motive of the said separation of others be not sufficiently expressed by some external act, he becomes separated from the Church, *animo*, in will and affection; which may

may happen : and if expressed, becomes separated, *actu*, actually and in effect, as it happened in that casting out of the Brethren by *Diotrephes*. And hence is clearly solved what you say next in your former Reply, *That he who separates another for that onely unjust cause of keeping due Catholique Communion may yet desire to keep Communion with the Church himself, though he envy it to another, &c.* Because this sentence quite destroyes its own supposition. For if he love Catholique communion in himself, and envy it in another, he cannot cast another out of the Church for this sole reason, because he keeps Catholique Communion; but he must have this other motive, because Catholique Communion brings so much spirituall (and it may be) temporall good to that person, whom he envies; or is some obsecuring, or detriment to him, &c. which are quite other motives. By this it appears, that that very act of separating others from the Church for this sole reason of keeping due Catholique Communion, which you alledge to be an active separation, beside that of ones self, is (according to its formall motive, where-

126 *The nullity of the first Argument.*

by it is specified) a formall separation of ones self: and so if it proved effectually your *Thesis*, it must be supposed to be no separation of ones self; and thereby becomes destructive of it self: which is the contradiction, which we contend you incur by the position of it.

P. 30.

*This may be further evidenced by your instance of the proud Prelate, as you call him, which we proved might become a schismaticque, by excommunicating another solely for keeping due Catholique Communion: and you deny not but we proved it; but you say, That hurts you not, because we should have proved he became a Schismaticque by such an act, as it is an active separation of another, and not of himself. And we affirm we proved it so; nor did we go about to prove any other way, then by such an act as it is an active separation of another, and not of himself. For we told you expressly, that we supposed him in the whole to have never elicited, or done any act internall or externall, of formall Schisme before this active ejection of another: and therefore he had not separated himself, which is an act of formall Schisme. If therefore we proved*  
any

any thing, which you deny not, we proved that Prelate guilty of Schism: by an active separation of another, and not of himself: and this we did, alwayes considering the Schismaticall act brought for the proof of our Assertion, with reference to the same Assertion.

C. 31.

Here you fall upon your former fallacy: For whatsoever you intended, or ought to have proved, and signified also you would prove, evinces no more, then that such a proof was to be exacted from you; which is not the question. So that in shewing all this, you say nothing to satisfy our answer: But if you had given satisfaction, you should have shewed, that the Arguments, which you used in that your Reply, supposed that act to be a proof of your *Thefts*, which they do not; and that they proceed not, as upon an absolute act, independent of any proof at all; which they do, as we have already proved. Now to say, that *Diotrephes* was not supposed by you to be a Schismaticque by any former act, precedent to that of casting out the Brethren, for keeping due *Catholique Communion*, is nothing at all

128 *The nullity of the first Argument.*

against us, or satisfactory to our reasons. For we say, that he became a Schismatic by that very act it self, considered *in prioritate rationis*, as a separation of himself, by a formall contempt of Catholique Communion, exercised in casting out the Brethren for that sole reason, before it be considered *as formally an unjust separation of others*. For seeing the contempt, or hate of Catholique Communion moved him to that unjust separation of others, it is the first formality which is to be considered in that act, *in prioritate rationis*: and so he being made by that a formall Schismatic, it can never be evinced, that he becomes a Schismatick by that act, as it is formally a sole unjust separation of others, or under the formality of an *unjust separation, quæ talis*, as such. By saying therefore, as you often say, that to excommunicate another *for this sole reason*, is to excommunicate unjustly, and so is an unjust excommunication; you prove nothing, unlesse you added and proved, that such excommunication is Schisme, as it is formally *unjust*, which you can never prove; unlesse you make it first appear, that every unjust excommu-

nica-

nication is Schisme ; which you have not done in this present Argument. For whatsoever is such a thing, *qua talis*, formally as such, must *always* be such, whenever that formality, or notion is found in it ; as is clear in Logick and Metaphysick.

And when you say (in a former Reply, to which you relate here) that you proved such a Prelate to be Schismaticall by the contempt of Catholique Communion, which is formally exercised in the separation of others, for this sole reason, *because they keep due Catholique Communion* ; for such a separation is a formal contempt of Catholique Communion ; we answer, that all this is true ; but say, that no man can thus contemn Catholique Communion, so long as he adheres to it himself, but must *in prioritare rationis*, at least, be supposed to contemn, reject, and relinquish (which words we used in our former answer) Catholique Communion, by a separation of himself from the Church, before he can be supposed to exercise this contempt of it, by persecuting others by unjust excommunication solely, because they keep due Catholique Communion.

130 *The nullity of the first Argument.*

For as none, but such as are supposed to be rebellious and seditious persons, actually divided from a Commonwealth, can banish others for this sole reason, *because they adhere to the Commonwealth*; so none but such as are supposed to be rebellious and seditious persons, actually divided from the Church, can excommunicate others for this sole reason, *because they adhere to the Church*, that is, *because they keep due Catholique Communion*. By what therefore is said in this section, undeniably appears, that instead of alledging an act to prove your *Thesis*, which is an active separation, *beside that of ones self*, you have instanced in an act, which is a most formall separation of ones self.

C H A P.



at most quidam Presbyteri maligni & perfidi, which you think are here defined. What if those certain Presbyters were schismaticques, in casting themselves of their own accord out of the Church? doth it thence follow, or doth he pretend therein to say, or any way to imply tacitely, that no other are Schismaticques, but such who of their own accord cast themselves out of the Church? which onely you know can verifie yours to be a definition, and about which onely, you know, our whole Controversie as yet is. His saying, though but of certain Presbyters yet we acknowledge it doth imply, that all others who do so, are Schismaticques, (which we affirme no lesse in our definition) but not, that no others then they which do so, are Schismaticques, (which you need.) If those five Presbyters, and we freely give you (à paritate rationis) all others also that are like them, are revinced to be Schismaticques, for casting out themselves; are not (we pray you) those and all such concluded to be Schismaticques, and that for so doing, for casting out themselves, as well in our definition as in yours, and as plainly, and as universally? what then makes this ground of yours (which is a necessary ground

ground of ours) more for you then for us ? unlesse he had said, or intimated, that no other were Schismaticques then such, of which he sayes not there, nor any where else, one syllable.

Your second ground is the Text of Saint Hierome, *Propriæ conscientiæ*, &c. When any one departs from the Church of his owne arbitrament, it seems to be the condemnation of his own conscience.

To make this for you as universall as it can possibly be interpreted, at most it speaks thus much. Whosoever at any time departs from the Church of his own accord, seems to have received the sentence of condemnation (adde if you please, the condemnation of Schisme, which yet is not said nor named.) But where doth he say, or give you to suspect, that no other are schismaticks, but such as depart of their own accord, and such as are condemned by their own conscience ? That onely which St. Hierome doth say there, or any where else, That onely might by his authority be alledged by you, to improve your saying to be a true definition. But that which St. Hierome sayes, speaks nothing to that at all, unless universall

from the Fathers defended.

137

verſall affirmatives were in any Logick argumentatively convertible by ſimple converſion; (hoc eſt) in plain ſpeaking, unleſſe it followed, that becauſe every particular Church is a company of men, therefore every company of men is a particular Church: or becauſe all Catholiques are men, therefore all men are Catholiques. Then indeed it might alſo follow, that as every definition is a propoſition, ſo every propoſition would be a definition, (and then yours would be one too) which the Philoſopher ſayes would be ſtrange, Metaphyſic. lib. 7. cap. 4. *τὰς δὲ γὰρ ἀντικείμεναι οὐ λόγους ὁποῖ.* What St. Cyprian and St. Hierome ſayes, you know, and any man may ſee, that our definition in the firſt part of it, as expreſſly and univerſally ſayes as yours, and theſe your grounds, your authors might truly and ſolidly be brought by us at any time (but not againſt you, for there is no need nor by you againſt us; for 'tis common to us both) to confirm the firſt part of our definition. But you, who place the whole definition of Schiſme in that, ſhould bring ſome authors that ſay, Not that all who voluntarily ſeparates themſelves from the Church are Schiſmatiques, but that  
all

all Schismaticques are those, which voluntarily separates themselves from the Church, and not those which voluntarily and actively separate others unjustly from the Church, for their keeping due Catholique Communion.

Next as to that Reverend Person Dr. Hammonds words, you shall soon discern, that he makes nothing for your definition, or for your negation, that voluntary active thrusting others out unjustly from the Church, for their keeping due and Catholique Communion is Schisme. For see him in that very Book, cap. 9. pag. 166.

“The onely hinderances that interpose and  
 “obstruct the desired freedom of externall  
 “Communion, are wholly imputable to the  
 “Romanists, (and how proves he this?)  
 “First, saith he, their excommunicating,  
 “and separating from their Assemblies,  
 “all that maintain Communion with the  
 “Church of England; which we know  
 “was done by Bull from the Pope about the  
 “tenth year of Queen Elizabeth (before  
 “which time, those English which had not  
 “joynd in our Reformation, might and  
 “did come to our Assemblies and were never  
 “after rejected by us, but upon their

avow-

" avowed contumacy against, &c.) and to  
 " that it is visibly consequent, that we that  
 " were cast out cannot be said to separate;  
 " and cap. 10. pag. 169, 170, 171. The  
 " Jewish Christians we know judged and  
 " damned all that would not, &c. And  
 " the like height Diotrephes, &c. And  
 " whether the Romanists, or we are thus  
 " guilty, will soon be discernible.... If St.  
 " Cyprians rule be true (who had as well  
 " saith he, considered the nature of Schism,  
 " and as diligently armed the Christians of  
 " his age against it, and given us as sure  
 " rules to judge by in this matter, as any)  
 " that they that maintain any difference  
 " in opinion against other Christians, must  
 " if they will avoid the evil of Schisme,  
 " manage it with this temper, *Neminem*  
 " *damnantes, neminem à Communione*  
 " *nostrâ arcentes.* Never condemn any,  
 " nor forbid them our Communion; then  
 " is the Schisme (because the uncharita-  
 " bleness) on their parts, not on ours. Thus  
 " saith he. And in the very place out of  
 " the Doctour, which you cite pag. 13. you  
 " may easily discern, That Dr. Hammond,  
 " even there doth not oppose the voluntary  
 " separating ones self, to the voluntary active  
 " sepa-

*separating, or thrusting others away unjustly from the Church, but onely to the passive, involuntary being cut off, or separated: which he would have noted not to be Schisme, and so would we.*

C. 33.

Concerning the authorities of St. Cyprian and St. Hierome, in confirmation of our Definition, we now go to shew against what you answer, that they contain, (although not precisely logicall and formall, which are not, as you know, to be expected from the Fathers, who were better Doctors of Christianity then Masters of Philosophy) yet reall and virtuell Definitions; that is, containing the definitive Attributes or Predicates, that is, the proper and essentiall notion of Schisme, though applied by them to particular persons, as occasion required, and not to the whole species, &c. as is prescribed by Aristotle; as ex. gr. If one should say, *Petrus est animal rationale, Peter is a reasonable creature*; though this were no formall Aristoteticall definition, because the subject of it is not the whole species of mankinde, but one single Individuum, or person contained under it,

it, yet in effect it is a real and vertuall definition of a man, because it contains in the *predicate* the specificall totall notion of man, common to the whole *species*, and convertible with it. Now we contend, that the definitions cited by us out of those two Fathers, are of this nature, of reall, or virtuall definitions; and that the attributes given in them to Schisme, or Schismatiques, contain the proper, specificall, essentiall notion of Schisme. That this may appear clearly, some *notanda* are to be premised. It is therefore first to be noted, that according to the doctrine of the Orthodoxall ancient Fathers, the true Church of Christ cannot be divided within it self, by that Schisme whereof we now treat. This doctrine is expressly delivered by St. Cyprian. *Epist. 12. ad Cornel. Et Ecclesia Catholica una esse, nec scindi, nec scindi posse, monstrata est.* The Church, saith he, is demonstrated to be one, and neither divided, nor can be divided. And *Epist. 6. ad Magnum. Foris enim non esse Ecclesiam, nec scindi adversum se aut dividi posse sed inseparabilis, atque individue domus unitatem tenere.* The Church, saith he, is not without, nor  
can



can it be cut, or divided against it self, but holds the unity of an inseparable and individuall, or undivided house. St. Austin. Tom. 8. in Psalm. 47. *Non insultent, Heretici in partes concisi, non se extollant qui dicant, Ecce hic est Christus ecce illic: Qui dicit, ecce hic est, ecce illic, ad partes inducit. Unitatem promiset Deus: reges in unum collecti sunt, non per Schismata dissipata sunt. Let not Heretiques divided into parts insult, let them not extoll themselves, who say, Behold Christ is here, behold he is there. He who saith, Behold he is here, behold he is there leads into parts. God hath promised unity: the kings are gathered together into one, not dissipated, or dispersed by Schismes.*

Secondly, hence is to be noted, that all Schismaticques are out of the Church, and quite separate from it, as a part cut off, is separate from the body. This is also the undoubted and constant doctrine of St. Cyprian, lib. 5. Epist. 6. *ad magnum. cit. Schismaticos, v. g. Novatianum in ecclesia non esse, nec gregis pastorem. That Schismaticques were not in the Church. v. g. Novatian, nor Pastour of the flock. Si autem grex unus est, quomodo gregi con-*  
*nume-*

*numerari potest, qui in numero gregis non est.* But, saith he, If the flock be one, how can he be annumerated to the flock, who is not in the number of the flock. *Aut pastor haberi quomodo potest, qui alienus sit & profanus.* Or how can he be esteemed a Pastour, who is become an alien, and a profane person. *Non habitans in domo Dei, id est, ecclesiâ Dei.* Not dwelling in the house of God, that is, in the Church of God. And it is most evident, that St. Cyprian was of this opinion; for it appears in his works, that he held the Rebaptization of those who were baptized by Schismatiques, as well as by Heretiques, because he esteemed them both equally out of the Church. St. Cyprian. *lib. 2. Ep. 1. ad Septianum. & epist. 9. ad eundem.* And Lucius a Castragalba in Concilio Carthaginensi sub Cypriano. *Item Schismaticos non posse condire sapientiâ spirituali, cum ipsi ab ecclesiâ, qua una est, recedendo infatuati contrarii facti sunt.* Neither can Schismatiques season with spirituall wisdom, because they being corrupted by receding from the Church, become contrary or adversaries. Which words deliver most clearly our definition of Schisme: for unlesse

lesse all Schismaticques recede from the Church, this saying will neither have force nor sense in it.

This is also taught most emphatically by St. Austin. *lib. de unitat. Eccles. cap. 4.* *Quicumque credunt quidem, quod Iesus Christus ita, ut dictum est, in carne venerit, & in eadem carne, in qua natus, & passus est, resurrexerit, & ipse sit filius Dei, Deus apud Deum, &c. Si tamen ab ejus corpore, quod est Ecclesia, ita dissentiant, ut eorum Communio non sit cum tota quacunque diffunditur, sed in aliquâ parte separatâ invenitur, manifestum est, eos non esse in Catholica Ecclesiâ. Whosoever believes that Iesus Christ, as is said, is come in flesh, and that he rose again in the same flesh, wherein he was born and suffered, and that he is the Son of God, and God with God, &c. Notwithstanding if they dissent so from his body, which is the Church, that their communion be not with the whole Church wheresoever it is diffused, but be found in some separate part, it is manifest, that they are not in the Catholique Church. Which words cannot be understood of any but Schismaticques. St. Fulgent. *De fide ad Petrum. cap. 38.* *Firmissimè tene, & nullatenus dubita non solum**

*solum omnes Paganos, sed etiam omnes Iu-  
daos, Hæreticos, & Schismaticos, qui ex-  
tra Ecclesiam Catholicam, præsentem fini-  
unt vitam, in ignem æternum ituros, &c.*  
Believe most firmly, and doubt not at all,  
that not onely all Pagans, but also all Jews,  
Heretiques and Schismaticques, which end  
their lives out of the Catholique Church,  
shall go into eternall fire.

Thirdly, it is to be noted, that the holy  
Fathers mention onely two wayes, where-  
by such as were once united to the true  
visible Church, and still remain under  
the denomination of Christians, cease to  
be parts of the said Church: the one by  
being cast out of it by the censure of Ex-  
communication, and the other by going  
out of their own accord by disobedience,  
pertinacy, dissention, faction, and spiri-  
tuall rebellion against their lawfull Eccle-  
siasticall superiours, or the whole Church.  
Thus St. Hierome, *Comment. in Epist. ad  
Titum. cap. 3. cited by us. Propterea ve-  
rò a semetipso dicitur esse damnatus (Hæ-  
reticus) quia Fornicator, Adulter, Homici-  
da, & cetera vitia, per Sacerdotes de Ec-  
clesiâ propelluntur; Hæretici autem in se-  
metipsos sententiam dicunt suo arbitrio ab*  
H Eccle-

*Ecclesià recedendo. Therefore he (viz. an Heretique) is said to be condemned of himself, because a Fornicatour, an Adulterer, a Murtherer, and the rest of vices, are expelled from the Church by the Priests; but Heretiques pronounce a sentence against themselves, receding from the Church of their own accord. St. Cyprian also, Epist. 40. cited for our definition. Pœnas quas meruerunt perpenderunt, ut à nobis non ejecti ultro se ejicerent, de ecclesià spontè se pellerent. They payed the punishment which they deserved, that not having been cast out by us, of their own accord they cast out themselves, they voluntarily expelled themselves from the Church. And. lib. 1. epist. 6. ad Magnum. Hic enim qui reus sibi erit, non ab episcopo ejectus, sed spontè de ecclesià profugus, & heretica presumptione a seipso damnatus. For this man, who is guilty, not cast out by the Bishop, but of his own accord a fugitive from the Church, and through hereticall presumption condemned of himself. And St. Austin delivers that of excommunication, lib. 11. Question. cap. 3. ex Augustino, serm. de verbis Apostoli. 14. Omnis Christianus qui excommunicatur, Satanae traditur: Quomodo? Scilicet quia*

*quia extra Ecclesiam est Diabolus, sicut in Ecclesiâ Christus: Ac per hoc quasi Diabolo traditur, qui ab Ecclesia communione remouetur. Unde illos, quos Apostolus Sathana traditos esse prædicat, esse excommunicatos demonstrat. Every Christian who is excommunicated, is delivered up to Sathan How that? To wit, because the Devill is without the Church, as Christ is in the Church. And by this he is, as it were, delivered to the Devill, whosoever is removed from the Communion of the Church. Whence the Apostle demonstrates those to be excommunicated, whom he pronounces to be delivered to Satan. And the other of separating themselves from the Church he treats. Tom 9. de Symbolo lib. 2. cap. 5. Hæreses omnes de illâ exierunt (scilicet Ecclesiâ) tanquàm Samenta inutilia de vite præcisa, ipsa autem manet in suâ radice; porta inferorum non vincet eam. All heresies have gone out of her (that is the Church) as unprofitable branches cut off from the vine: but she (the Church) remains in her root, the gates of hell shall not overcome her.*

Fourthly, we note, that the Orthodox ancient Fathers, who remained in the uni-

ty of the Catholique Church (and speak not in wrath and anger, as *Firmilian* did against *Stephen*, whilest he (*Firmilian*) persisted in his error, and under the censure of excommunication) never made the least mention, that every voluntary thrusting, and separating others, without sufficient cause from the Communion of the one Body of Christ (as you expresse yourselves in your definition) makes him who thus separates others, cease to be a part or member of the true visible Church. But the said ancient Fathers contented themselves with the two foresaid wayes of ceasing to be members of the Church; and we desire, that the places wherein they mention this third of yours, be particularly cited.

We note fifthly, That all the said Fathers agree, and you with them, that he, who is separated from the Church by any excommunication whatsoever, becomes not by vertue of that sole excommunication, or separation, a Schismaticque; and that consequently formall Schisme consists not in that, but they contrarily affirm, as you also acknowledge, that who-soever separates himself voluntarily from  
the



the Church, is at least a Schismaticque.

These *Notandum's* supposed, we infer our intended consequence, that whensoever the Fathers say, that any one separates himself voluntarily from the whole Church, they intend to prove thereby, that he commits formall Schisme; and that the true notion of Schisme consists in this alone: For if every *Schismaticque* be out of the body of the Catholique Church, and separate from it, as we proved in our second *Notandum*; and that there is no way to be separated from the Church, but either by Excommunication, or voluntary separation of ones self, as we proved in our third *Notandum*; and that separating made by Excommunication is not Schisme, as is proved in the fourth *Notandum*; it followes evidently, That Schisme essentially must be a voluntary separation of ones self from the whole true visible Church of Christ, which is our definition, and consequently that St. Cyprian and St. Hierome cited by us, saying, That Schismaticques separate themselves from the Church, *spontè*, voluntarily, delivered in those words the proper notion, and definitive essentiall attri-

butes of Schisme; and so gave in them a reall and virtuall definition of Schisme, and not a sole true proposition related to it, as you pretend; which is all we intended: And by this, the whole substance of your Answer to those two Authorities is enervated and made of no force, which will never be of force against our definition, till you have efficaciously proved, that your third way of ceasing to be a member of the true Church, viz. *By causelesse Excommunication of others*, is the constant Doctrine of the Ancient Orthodox Fathers: which you have not yet done, nor (as we really conceive) will ever be able to do.

Beside these general and undeniable deductions, it is most manifest, that St. Hierome in the place cited by us, defines Schisme. For he sayes thus; *Ceterum nullum Schisma non sibi aliquam confingit heresim, ut rectè ab Ecclesià recessisse videatur. But every Schisme (to wit in the progresse of it, though not in the beginning, as he there affirms) feigns some Heresie, that it may seem to have justly receded from the Church. Which saying supposes evidently, that every Schisme recedes,*

cedes, or divides it self from the Church : for if every one did not so recede, some Schisme might be found , which laboured not to justifie its recession from the Church , by framing of Heresies , to wit, those which made no recession from it. But St. *Hierome* sayes , That every *Schisme* feigns some Heresie for justifying that recession ; therefore he supposes, that every Schisme recedes from the Church, and so makes Schisme convertible with that of recession.

To the words cited by us out of Dr. *Hammond*, you deny not that it is delivered by him, as a proper definition of schism; neither indeed could you deny it with any shew of probability, for he sayes expressly, *The distinct notion of the word Schisme, is a voluntary separating or receding of any member from the unity of the body, id est, the Church of Christ, &c.* All therefore that you answer is, first, that he delivers a contrary doctrine (consonant , as you conceive to your definition, and dissonant to ours) in other places. Which seems to us a strange kinde of proof against the Adversaries of Dr. *Hammond*, as well as yours. For what force will it have against

us, or our cause, if Dr. *Hammond* in different places of his Book, deliver different and dissonant doctrines; which seems onely to discredit him, and brings no great credit to you, or your party: either therefore you must give some congruous sense to the words cited by us, that they may agree with the others cited by you, which you have not done; or all you say, will demonstrate, that Dr. *Hammond* speaks contrarieties; which is nothing to our difficulty. Now if Dr. *Hammond* include the separation of others mentioned in your definition, in those other places by you cited, you must not onely say, he contradicts himself, but that this his definition cited by us, is as defective as you pretend ours to be. For here he says expressly, that the distinct notion of the word Schisme, is a voluntary dividing himself from the Church of God, as we do; and on the other side, he makes no more mention of dividing others from the Church causelessly in this his definition, then we do in ours: if therefore you pretend ours to be an imperfect definition, for wanting that clause of yours, you must, *à paritate rationis*, grant, his to be an  
im-

imperfect definition for the same want. But the truth is, that as Dr. Hammond hath delivered a perfect and genuine definition of Schisme, so he neither contradicted it, nor added your said clause, as an essentiall formality of Schisme, in the places by you cited.

This I prove. In the place *Chap. 9. pag. 166.* he sayes onely, that our excommunicating and separating from our Assemblies, those of the English Protestant Church, makes the case of English Protestants such, that they who are thus cast out, cannot be said to separate: which though it were admitted for the present, sayes nothing at all of that excommunicating, or casting out, to be an essentiall formality of Schisme, but onely a reason to excuse you from voluntary Schisme; which are very different. The second place cited by you, *Cap. 10. pag. 169, 170.* proves as little as the former; for speaking of that judging or despising of others in the Jewish and Gentile Christians, contained in the words which you alledge, he sayes first, *Either of which was, if not formall Schisme, yet soon improveable into it.* Where he of purpose professes not

to determine positively, that either of them were formally Schisme, and esteems it more certain to term them *Improveables into Schisme*, which we deny not in certain cases; and secondly, that they may be esteemed *such Improveables*, he addes this limitation, *When it would not be repressed by the Apostles admonitions*; which seeing it insinuates a contempt and rejection of Apostolicall Authority, would indeed improve such acts into Schisme, as we have already granted in *Diotrephes*. To the inference drawn from the mistaken words of St. Cyprian by Dr. Hammond, (as we have already shewed from St. Austins Authority) That the Schisme (because the uncharitablenesse) is on your parts, not on ours. I answer, that those words are to be understood causally, not formally; that is, that if there be any Schisme, the cause of it is to be imputed to us, not to you. Now he who is cause of the Adultery of another, cannot therefore be formally termed an Adulterer; as also for the same reason, he who is cause of anothers Schisme, cannot be therefore properly termed a Schismaticke. For if that judging and despising others

others was not determined by Dr. Hammond to be formall Schisme, he cannot be supposed with any consequence of Doctrine, to determine here, that it makes us formally Schismaticques. To what you lastly say, That Dr. Hammond in his definition cited by us, opposes not *voluntary separating ones self*, to the voluntary active separating, or *thrusting others away unjustly* from the Church, but onely to the *passive, involuntary being cut off*, or separated, which you desire should be noted: we answer, That it imports nothing to what he opposes it, for the perfection of his definition, or consonance with ours, so long as he frames a full and formall definition of Schisme, without including that your active separation of others; which actuall inclusion you esteem necessary to a competent definition of Schism; and which he would have noted *not to be necessary*, and so would we.



## S E C T. 2.

*More Authorities of the holy Fathers, cited to confirm the Definition of the Catholique Disputants.*

C. 34.

**T**O confirm our Definition, we adde the Authorities of the first and latter Ages.

St. Cyprian. *Epist. ad Florentium Pupianum*, *Epist. 69*. In which Epistle he reprehends *Pupianus* for his insolency, *Et quia fecit se Episcopum Episcopi*, and proves himself a holy Catholique by his Communion with the Church, and with the chief Pastour, and demonstrated Schisme by the contrary. *Inde schismata & Hareses oborta sunt & oriuntur, dum Episcopus, qui unus est & Ecclesia præest, superbi quorundam presumptione contemnitur, & homo dignatione Dei honoratus, indignus hominibus judicatur.* From hence arise Schismes, when the Bishop that is one, and who is the Governour of the Church, is contemned by the proud presumption of some, and the man of God honoured by him, is dishonoured by men. Here the nature of Schisme

Schisme is stated to be a presumptuous departure from Communion with the Head, or principal member of the Church of Christ, that is, from the whole Church. For St. Cyprian addes in the same Epistle, *Scire debes Episcopum in Ecclesiâ esse, & Ecclesiam in Episcopo.* Epist. ad Rogatianum Ep. 65. *De superbo Diacono.*

*Hac sunt enim initia Hæreticorum, & ortus & conatus Schismaticorum, male cogitantium, ut sibi placeant, ut præpositum superbo tumore contemnant; sic de Ecclesiâ receditur, sic Altare profanum foris collocatur, sic contra pacem Christi, & ordinationem & unitatem Dei rebellatur.* These are the origine of Heretiques and Schismatiques, who to please themselves, contemn the president of the Church, and so rebell against the peace of Christ, and the ordination and unity of God. And in the entrance of the same Epistle, he compares Schismatiques unto *Corah, Dathan, and Abiram*, who separated themselves from the Communion of the Jews and their high Priest *Aaron*. What can these words import lesse, then our definition, that Schisme is a voluntary separation from the body of Christs Church?

Epist.

Epist. 55. ad Cornelium. Neque enim aliunde Hæreses obortæ sunt, aut nata sunt Schismata quàm inde quod Sacerdoti Dei non obtemperatur, nec unus in Ecclesiâ Dei ad tempus Sacerdos, & ad tempus Iudex vice Christi cogitatur: Cui si secundum magisteria Divina obtemperaret fraternitas universa, nemo adversum Sacerdotum collegium quidquam moveret.--- Nemo dissidio unitatis Christi Ecclesiam scinderet. Hereses and Schismes cannot otherwise spring but from hence: That the high Priest of God is not obeyed; one Priest in the place of Christ is not received as Judge. To whom if the whole fraternity of Christians would yield obedience, no man would contend with the college of Priests, no man by a separation of unity would divide the Church of Christ. In these epistles, and diverse more, (as in his epistle to Cornelius. De fortunato & felicissimo, and others) St. Cyprian evermore comprizeth the notion of Schisme within the terms of our definition: That it was a presumptuous, voluntary, pertinacious *dissidium*; or separation from the unity of the Church; a voluntary separation from the chief pastor, Bishop, Head of the Church of Christ, and from Communion

munion with that Body, of which he was Head. And certainly, where so many cases of Schisme from the Novatians were emergent, as in St. *Cyprian's* time, that Schismatiques were so presuming, it is more then probable, some of them did not onely separate themselves from the Body of the Church, but did also thrust others from their Communion, among whom *Puppianns* might be one, who constituted himself *Episcopum Episcopi, & Judicem Judicis Christi*. And therefore might be conceived to separate others from the Church, who communicated not with him: yet St. *Cyprian* defines his Schism to consist in a separation from the chief Pastour, or Head of Christs Church, or from the Church in Communion with him.

To make it evident beyond exception, that Schisme among the ancient Fathers, in its notion, sense, essence, and specificall nature, was sufficiently expressed in our definition, it will appear from St. *Austin*, in his disputations with the Donatists, who were notorious Schismatiques, and who were not onely such as actively separated themselves from the unity of the Church,

Church, but who actively separated others, by casting forth, thrusting forth, excommunicating, or what you will, all except their *pars Donati*; yet even these, and all other Schismaticques, St. *Austin* alwayes comprehended under our definition.

St. *Austin*. lib. 20. *contra Faustum*. cap. 30. *Schisma est eadem opinantem, & eodem ritu colentem quo ceteri, solo congregationis delectari dissidio*, which is our definition: Schisme is a voluntary *dissidium*, or separation from the congregation, viz. of the Church.

St. *Austin*. lib. 4. *contr. Donatistas*. cap. 14. *Nam & cetera omnia vera vel censeatis, vel habeatis, & in eadem separatione tamen duretis, contra vinculum fraternae pacis, adversus unitatem omnium fratrum*. Thus he states the Schisme of the Donatists, if ye continue in separation against the bond of Brotherly peace, and the Unity of all Brethren of the Church.

Lib. 2. *contr. Donatistas* cap. 6. *Respondete, quare vos separastis? quare contra orbem terrarum Altare erexistis? quare non communicastis Ecclesiis? Respondete*

*spondete, quare separastis? propterea certe ne malorum communione periretis. Quomodo ergo non perierunt Cyprianus & collega ejus? quare ab innocentibus separastis? Sacrilegium Schismatis vestrum defendere non potestis.* The holy Father disputing against *Schismatiques* asks them, as we may, *à pari*, ask Protestants, *Why have you separated your selves? Why have you erected an Altar against the whole world? Answer me, why did you separate? certainly you separated, lest you should perish in the communion of the wicked: how then did not Cyprian and his Colleagues perish?*

Here Schisme is defined by way of question. *Why did you separate? Why did you erect an Altar against the whole world? Why did you not communicate with the Churches? that is, Why are you Schismatiques?* As we may propose to Protestants, whom we hold *Schismatiques*; *Why did you separate your selves? Why have you erected an Altar against the whole world of Christians? Why did you not communicate with the Churches? For doing all this you are condemned of Schisme.*

Now

Now to our present conference, the exceptions proposed by you in your definition are impertinent; For as the Controversie was throughly decided by St. *Austin* against the Donatists, in proving that they did separate, they did erect an Altar, a Religion against that professed in the whole world; they did not communicate with the Churches, yea, did separate, because they should otherwise perish with wicked Churches; the Conclusion was good against the Donatists, Therefore they were Schismatiques: so which of our parties could have charged justly upon the other, *You separated your selves, you erected an Altar, a Religion which was not then extant in the Churches, you separated from all Churches, you separated, lest you should perish in the corruption of the universall Church, in which the Saints of God could not perish; That party so charged, and justly, had been schismaticall, and their Church, which was all intended by the question. Therefore your exceptions to our Definition, and your defence of them have been rather witty then pertinent, rather to express Logickall and Metaphysicall Curiosities, then solid*  
Fun-



Fundamentall Truth in this materiall point of Schisme. And we once more offer to your selves and the Auditory, whether it be not more congruous and satisfying, to proceed in the conviction of Schismatiques by the method of Saint *Austin* and *St. Cyprian*, by their evidentiall demonstrative proofs of Schisme, then by adhering to some Niceties, or other Latitudes, or schismaticall Acts; which either will be involved in our Definition, or enough, or as much will be in our Definition, as was in the Fathers, for the convincing of Schismatiques of the first Ages. But I proceed.

*St. Austin. lib. 3. contra Donatist. cap. 2.*  
*Nos itaque, ut dicere ceperam, in Ecclesia illius communionem secuti sumus, per ejus universitatem id nunc agitur, quod & ante Agrippinum, & inter Agrippinum & Cyprianum, per ejus universitatem similiter agebatur.* We are secure in the communion of that Church, by whose universality that is now done; which was done by the same universality, both before Agrippinus, and between Agrippinus and Cyprian. *Plura habet in eodem capite.* *St. Austin* proves himself, and others in communion with

with him, to be safe, and *no Schismaticques*, because they communicated with that universality of Christians before *Agrippinus*, and between his time and *Cyprians*, and with the universality of the present Church. The Donatists did not so, but separated themselves from that body; *ergo*, they were Schismaticques. And whereas it may be replied, that you never intended to deny such to be Schismaticques who separate themselves, &c. but that some other acts may be, and are schismaticall, beside those whereby a man separateth himself; and so *St. Austins* allegations are true, but not against us. We affirm, that it seems incredible to us, that so learned a person as *St. Austin*, skilled in the Logicks of *Aristotle*, and having to do with learned wits, *Petilian*, *Emeritus*, *Cresconius* the Gramaraian, in his 13. and 14. Books against them, should almost in every Chapter insist upon our Definition onely, as it is in terms, had it been insufficient as you averre, and not at all upon your additionall exception: surely it appeared to him, that such an act was either involved in the terms of his Argument, whereby he alwayes proved

proved them Schismaticques, viz. by their separating themselves from the body of the Church; or that it was an Act sometimes occasionall onely of Schisme, sometimes consequential, never formal Schism, but by some conjunctive formality annexed to it.

Lib. 7. contra Donatist. cap. ultimo. Unde Cyprianus, & qui cum eo senserunt, Catholicæ Ecclesiæ, quam noluerint præcedere, non potuerint præscribere. Quod verò aliter non sapuerint, non expavescimus, quia cum eis veneramur & Petrum. Quod vero ab unitate Ecclesiæ non recesserunt, gaudemus, quia cum eis ædificamur in Petrà. Cyprian and those who were of his opinion, could not prescribe to that Church, which they would not divide: That they thought otherwise then the Church, we yet venerate them and Peter. That they would not separate from the unity of the Church, we rejoyce, because with them we are built upon the Rock. By this Argument of separating from the unity of the Church, the Donatists were Schismaticques, but St. Cyprian, that held unity, was not.

Lib. contra Petilianum. Nulla igitur ratio

ratio fuit, sed maximus furor, quod isti, velut communionem caventes, se ab unitate Ecclesie, quanto omnibeterrarum diffunditur, separarunt. There was no cause, but a great madness, that they, fearing communion, should separate themselves from the unity of the Church, through the whole earth. This is Schisme in its proper and known essence, distinctive specifically, and in this we should insist, which of us, as the Donatists did, have separated ourselves from the unity of the Church of the whole earth.

Lib. ad Donat. post Collationem. Quisquis ergo ab hac Catholica Ecclesia fuerit separatus, quantumlibet laudabiliter vivere se existimet, hoc solo scetore, quod a Christi unitate fuerit sejunctus, non habebit vitam, sed ira Dei manet super ipsum. *Whoever is separated from the Catholic Church, although he lead a good life, yet for this only sin, that he remains separated from the unity of Christ, he shall not have life, but the wrath of God is upon him, that is, because he is a Schismaticus.*

St. Austin. lib. De Fide & Symbolo, cap. 10. He distinguisheth between Schisme;

Schisme; and certainly as he giveth the full notion of Heresie, so he gives the full and compleat notion and essence of Schisme; otherwise he could not compleatly distinguish them, in regard of their vicinity; in that every Heretique is a Schismaticque, although every Schismaticque is not an Heretique; and also that in time every Schismaticque will be an Heretique, according to St. Hierome. He therefore must difference them essentially, in their compleat and essentiall notions; and yet he exceeds not our definition.

*Heretici de Deo falso sentiendo ipsam fidem violant.*

*Schismatici discessionibus iniquis à fraternâ charitate diffiliunt, quamvis ea credunt, quæ credimus.* And to this agreeth the same Father, *Libr. Quæst. Evangelic. in Matthæum, cap. II. Solet quæri, Schismatici quid ab Hereticis distent; & hoc inveniri quod Schismaticos non fides diversa facit, sed communionis disrupta societas.* To separate from communion is the formall and specificall essence, and so the definition of Schisme.

We could multiply the expressions of  
the

the Fathers, both Greek and Latine, who ever treating upon Schisme, conceive they explicated the nature and essence of Schisme very fully, when they used the termes of our Definition; as you may see in St. *Basil. Canon. ad Amphilo-  
chum*, and St. *Bernard*. But this evidence for us from the Ancients is sufficient, as we conceive.

---

# SECT.

## S E C T. 3.

*Some Authorities of later Auth<sup>rs</sup>, cited  
in Confirmation of the said Definition.*

## C. 35.

**W**E shall fall down to the Divines  
of the last 400. years, some of  
which lived before this last Schisme, were  
both good Catholiques and Aristotelians;  
and present to the view of all indifferent  
and learned persons, whether we had not  
reason to give our Definition as we did,  
and to maintain it without any alterati-  
on. We onely adde, that in St. Gregories  
dayes, the form of Subscription, whereby  
Heretiques and Schismaticques protested  
against Schisme, was as followeth.

*Lib. 10. Epist. Ep. 30. Sub mei ordinis  
casu spondeo & Anathematis oblatione, at-  
que promitto tibi, & per te Sancto Petro  
Apostolorum principi, atque ejus Vicario  
Beatissimo Gregorio, vel successoribus  
ipsius, me nunquam quorumlibet suasioni-  
bus, vel quocunque alio modo ad Schisma,  
à quâ, misericordiâ redemptoris nostri libe-  
rante, ereptus sum, reversurum, sed semper*



*me in unitate sanctæ Ecclesiæ Catholicæ, & communione Romani Pontificis per omnia permansurum.* From this Subscription we frame this *Dilemma*: either it was a full renunciation of Schisme, or not; if it was not, St. Gregory understod not the nature of Schisme: if it was, then our definition is compleat, where he promised to abide in, or not to separate from the Unity of the Catholique Church, and Communion with the Roman Bishop.

If some of these Authorites seem not to say expressely, That every Schisme is a separation of *mes self* from the Church, but onely that all such separations are Schismes, which you grant; you may please to consider, first, the continuall mentioning of such a separation amongst the holy Fathers, when they speak of Schisme; their constant proving others to be Schismatiques, because they so separate, and never giving any other formall reason, save this, of becomming Schismatiques; nor so much as mentioning yours, *Of thrusting others unjustly from the Churches communion*, in their definitions and descriptions of Schisme; no nor accusing the Donatists to have become

come formally *Schismatiques*, by excluding those of the *Catholique* party of their times from the true Church of Christ, (because they communicated not with them, nor baptized such as returned from *Heretiques* to the *Catholique* communion) but esteemed them sufficiently convinced of *Schisme*, by their sole separation of themselves from the Communion of the whole visible Church; we say, you may please to consider these particulars, and it will plainly appear, that they constituted the formall notion of *Schisme* in this sole separation, and nothing else; and withall we desire, you would again call to minde, for the right understanding of these and such like Sentences of the Fathers, what we have already said, and drawn from our *Notanda*, for clearing the like Sayings of St. *Cyprian* and St. *Hierome*.

In our citation of the School-men, Ancient or Modern, wheresoever there is mention made of the Supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*, and necessity to live in unity with him, and in obedience to him as Head of the visible Church, to avoid *Schisme*; we here declare, that it neither

is, nor was our drift or intention, to prove the Popes supremacy by those testimonies in this present conference; as neither being the question in hand, nor those authorities a sufficient testimony against our Adversaries. And we declare further, that we have no intention to ground the truth of our definition against our present Adversaries in the said testimonies, as taken apart from the former of the holy Fathers; but that which we intend particularly by citing them, is first to shew, that our definition is not new, particular, or invented by us, but ancient, common, and imbraced by the generall consent of Divines of the former and later ages; and secondly, to adde a strength of Authority to it, from these School-Authours, as they carry on this Definition in unity and correspondence to the ancient Fathers,

St. Tho. Aquinas.

*Schismatis peccatum, speciale vitium est Charitati oppositum; quo quidam Christo, ac ejus vicario subesse renuunt, et membris Ecclesie ei subjectis communicare recusant.*  
Schisme is a sin opposed to charity, whereby they refuse to obey Christ and his Deputy,

puty, and refuse to communicate with the members of the Church in Communion with him. 22x Qu. 39. Art. 1. In Corpore Questionis.

*Schismatici dicuntur, qui propria sponte & intentione ab Ecclesie unitate se separant, quae est unitas principalis.*

Alex. Alenfis. Quaest. 144. de Schif.

*Schisma est illicita ab unitate Ecclesie dissensio.* Schisme is an unlawful dissenting from the unity of the Church.-- He addes, but it may be enquired, what kinde of departure that is, which is Schisme; for if every transgression, or contempt of the Canons be Schisme, Schismes would encrease; therefore Schisme is a departure in those, who annihilate the authority of the Roman Church, by contempt of her precepts and orders, nor by esteeming her as head, &c.

Turrian in Aquin.

*Est ergo peccatum schismatis voluntaria separatio ab Ecclesia unitate, &c.* Schisme is a voluntary separation from that Church which is one, and whose head is the Roman Bishop.

Cajetanus in Aquin.

*Ex eo aliquis est Schismaticus, quod re-*

nuit ut pars Ecclesie operari: nec refert ex  
 quâcunque causa hoc oriatur; dummodo  
 enim ad hoc deveniatur, quod renuit se ha-  
 bere ut partem unius Ecclesie, Schisma in-  
 currit. Inobedientia enim, quantumcun-  
 que pertinax, non constituit Schisma, nisi  
 sit rebellio ad officium Papæ vel Ecclesie,  
 ita ut renuat ei subesse. Idem Cajetanus  
 docet, Esse Schismaticos, quicunque ex  
 quâcunque diversitate vel sententiarum  
 vel affectionum adeo exorbirent, ut velint  
 sanctificare, vel sanctificari (per dicitur  
 videlicet ~~et~~ usum Sacramentorum) docere  
 vel doceri, providere vel provideri, non in  
 pars Ecclesie Catholice, sed tanquam ipsi-  
 met sint velut quoddam totum sepium.  
 He is a Schismaticke, who refuseth to  
 operate as a part of the Church, neither  
 is it materiall, from what ever cause this  
 ariseth, so as it comes to this, That he  
 refuseth to behave himself as a part of  
 that one Church, he incurs Schisme. For  
 disobedience, even to pertinacity, doth  
 not denominate Schisme, unlesse it be a  
 rebellion against the office of the Pope, or  
 the Church, so as he refuseth to be sub-  
 ject to it. And Schismaticques are those  
 whoever, from what diversity soever of  
 opinions

opinons or affections, are so exorbitant, that they will sanctifie or be sanctified (by the *cultus*, or use of Sacraments) teach or be taught, provide or be provided for, not as part of the Catholique Church, but as if they were a certain whole separate thing, or Church, of themselves.

Turrecremata de Ecclesiâ, cap. de  
Schismate, cites Raymund de  
Sabunde, his Definition  
of Schisme.

*Schisma est illicitus ab unitate & universalitate discessus.* Schisme is an unlawful departure from the unity and universality of the Church. He cites Hostiensis in Summa. Tit. de Schismate.

*Schisma est illicita divisio per inobedientiam ab unitate Ecclesie.* Schisme is an unlawfull division made by disobedience or contempt, to or from the unity of the Church.

At length Turrecremata gives us his own definition: *Discessio ab unitate universalis Ecclesie, quæ est unitas principalis.* A departure from the unity of the

universall Church, which is the principall unity. And addes, *Schismatici dicuntur hi, qui subesse renunt Summo Pontifici, & qui membris Ecclesie ei subjectis communicare recusant.* Schismatiques are those, who refuse to obey the Chief Bishop, and to communicate with the members of the Church subject to him.

Gregor. de Valentia. Disp. 3.

Quæst. 15.

*Schisma est disjunctio, qua quis se separat ab unitate Ecclesie, ut Ecclesia est unum quoddam corpus mysticum, constans ex diversarum conditionum fidelibus, tanquam ex membris inter se connexis, & præcipuè cum Capite, nimirum cum Summo Pontifice, Christi Vicario.* Schisme is a separation, by which one separates himself from the unity of the Church, as the Church is one mysticall body, consisting of faithfull persons of diverse conditions, as members united, and especially with their Head, the Chief Bishop, Christs Deputy.

Farina-



Farinacius cites Barthol. Ugolinus  
his Definition, in Tract. de Cen-  
suris Pontifici reservatis,  
in Glosâ.

*Schisma nihil aliud est, quam separatio  
ab unitate Ecclesie universalis, quâ Chri-  
stianus subtrahit se ab obedientiâ capitis  
Ecclesie, Romani pontificis, quatenus Ec-  
clesia caput est, vel à Communione membro-  
rum Christi, nolens esse ejusdem Ecclesie  
membrum.* Schisme is nothing else, then  
a separation from the unity of the univer-  
sal Church, whereby a Christian with-  
draws himself from obedience to the head  
of the Church, as it is head of the Church,  
or from the Communion of the members  
of the Church, refusing to be a member of  
the same.

He cites Sanchez in præcept. Decalogi.  
lib. 2. cap. 36. num. 1.

*Schisma est disjunctio, per quam quis se  
ab unitate Ecclesie separat, in quantum est  
corpus Mysticum, ex universis fidelibus, &  
Romano Pontifice constans.* Schisme is a

separation, by which one separates himself from the unity of the Church, as it is a body consisting of all the faithful, and the Bishop of Rome their head.

Biel. distinct. 13. q. 2. Art. 3.

*Schisma proprie acceptum est illicita divisio, per inobedientiam, ab unitate Ecclesie.*  
Schisme properly taken, is an unlawfull division, or separation by disobedience, from the unity of the Church.

Gerson. part. 1. de modo habendi se in tempore Schismatis.

*Schisma, non solum est in separatione membri à capite, sed etiam membrorum ab invicem, quando propter questum aut vanam gloriam, &c. separat se à membris veris & vivis Ecclesie.* Schisme is not onely a separation of a member from the head, but of one member from another, when they separate from the true and living members of the Church.

Antoninus. Titul. 22. cap. 11.

*Dieuntur Schismatici omnes resistentes*  
Pape,

Papa, non quocunque modo, sed per spontaneam intentionem, & manifestam rebellionem. Schisma importat divisionem ab unitate fidei, & charitatis Ecclesie. They are termed Schismatiques, who resist the Pope, not by any way or kinde of resistance, but by a spontaneous intention, and manifest rebellion. Schisme imports a division from the unity of faith, and charity of the Church.

Ægidius Coninck. cap. de Schismate.

Schisma à Patribus & Theologis sumitur pro scissura, vel divisione, quâ aliqui se ab Ecclesiâ separant, nolendo cum reliquis Catholicis communicare, atque ita unitatem ejus scindunt, atque dividunt. Schisme is taken by the Fathers and Divines for a scissure, or division, by which men separate themselves from the Church, and divide the unity of it, refusing to communicate with the rest of Catholics.

Hieronym. de Medicis à Camerino.  
secunda. secundæ.

Sciendum quod ad rationem Schismatis non sufficit, ut quis faciat aliquod unitati repugnans,

repergnans, sed oportet ut intendat divisionem vel scissuram: Sicut enim in naturalibus id quod est per accidens, non constituit speciem; ita in moralibus. Et definit, Schisma propriè opponitur principali unitati Ecclesie, quam charitas facit; & est, quo quis ab ejusmodi unitate separare intendit.-- Schisma opponitur unitati principali Ecclesie. To constitute Schisme, it is not enough to oppose unity, but it must be with intention to separate.-- Schisme properly is opposed to the principal unity, which charity makes; and it is that sin, whereby one intends to separate himself from unity. Schism is opposed to the principal unity of the whole Church.

Lorca in secund. m. secundæ.

*Schisma est recessus, vel divisio ab unitate Ecclesie.*

Vasquez. in cap. de Schismate.

*Schisma est disjunctio, quâ quis se separat ab unitate Ecclesie, &c.* Schisme is a disjunction, by which one separates from the unity of the Church.

Suarez

Suarez. adversus Jacobum regem Angliæ lib. 1. cap. 21. num. 2.

*Schisma, per Antonomasiā, jam propriè significat divisionem Ecclesiæ Catholicæ, per spontaneam separationem ab illā, sub Christiano nomine particularem congregationem, seu conventiculum. extra Ecclesiæ unitatem, communionem & obedientiam congregando. Et num. 4. Manifestum est Schisma committi per separationem ab Ecclesiæ unitate, charitati ejus contrariam. Schisme signifieth a division of the Catholique Church by voluntary separation from it; and congregating a particular Church, or conventicle, without the unity, communion, and obedience of, or to the Church. And it is evident, Schisme is committed by separation from the unity of the Church.*

Bonacina. de casib. Conscient. de Schif.

*Schisma est voluntaria, & pertinax subtractio ab obedientiā universalis Ecclesiæ. Schisme is a voluntary and pertinacious withdrawing, and separating from the obedience of the universall Church, vel summi Pontificis, qui in Ecclesiæ ejus locum tenet.*

Fil.

## Filiucius de Casib. cap. de Schism.

*Schisma est separatio ab unitate Ecclesie Catholice, & ejus Capite, Summo Pontifice.* Schisme is a separation from the unity of the Catholique Church, and the chief Bishop, or Head thereof.

Thus we shew, that both Fathers, Modern Divines, and those acute Aristotelians, have used no other Definition then ours, and have owned it, as a compleat, convertible Proposition. The School-men cited by us, who were since the separation, we produce not as an Argument against you (they being a party) otherwise then as they correspond with all Divines, former Fathers, and Modern, and as we present with them an entire Body almost from all ages of Christianity, confirming our Definition, either virtually or in terms; and that precisely, adequately, no more, no lesse, then we have stated in our Definition.

SECT.

**SECT. 4.**  
*The foresaid Definition is confirmed by  
 the Authorities of English Protestant  
 Divines.*

**EX. 36.**

**F**ROM the Testimonies of the Fathers  
 and School-men, we descend to your  
 own Doctors, and shew, some of the  
 chief of them, who have treated of pur-  
 pose this point of Schisme, agree with  
 our definition, inso much as it is excepted  
 against by you, in your addition of unjust  
 separation of others.

We have already made it cleer, that  
 Dr. Hammond's is both a proper Defini-  
 tion of Schisme, and the very same in  
 substance with ours; we proceed to  
 others.

**Dr. Field of the Church.**

*Lib. 1. cap. 10.*

*It hath which, after estrange and admis-  
 sion into the House of God, depart and go our  
 again, whether two sorts: For either they  
 depart of themselves, leaving the fellowship  
 and*



and forsaking the Faith, as *Schismaticques* and *Heretiques*; or else they are cast out by the Censures of the Guides of the Church, as excommunicate persons, &c. In which words he plainly delivers the Doctrine deduced by us from the holy Fathers, that there are onely these two wayes to cease to be of the Church, amongst those who pass under the name of Christians.

Dr. Field goes on,

Concerning the first sort, *Schismaticques* are they that break the unity of the Church, and refuse to submit themselves to their lawfull Pastors and Guides, though they receive an entire profession of the Truth of God, as did the *Luciferians*, &c. Now those who unjustly separate others *injuria juris*, that is, for maintaing some Catholique Truth, which they who cast them out condemne as erroneous, receive not an entire profession of the Truth of God, as Dr. Field sayes here, *Schismaticques* strictly so called do. And if they separate another *injuria facti*, for some crime, or fact, whereof he is neither guilty, nor sufficiently, in *foro externo*, proved to be guilty, yet according to Dr. Field, if such an unjust Excommunication

tour

tour refuse not to submit himself to his lawful Pastors and Guides, and thereby remains in the unity of the Church, he will not be a Schismaticque. Chap. 15. Though Dr. Field treats expressly of unjust Excommunicators, yet he never sayes that they are Schismaticques, for that reason, or that Schisme consists in unjust separation of others from the Church.

Lib. 3. cap. 5. Schisme is a breach of the unity of the Church, which consisteth in three things. First, the subjection of the people to their lawfull Pastours. Secondly, the Communion and conjunction which many particular Churches and the Pastours of them have among themselves. Thirdly, in holding the same rule of faith. The unity of each particular Church dependeth of the unity of the Pastours. In respect of this first kinde of unity, if they who should obey this one Pastour, do either withdraw themselves wholly, refusing to be subject to any Ministry, or when one is elected, do set up another against him, and forsake the right. This is the first kinde of Schisma.

Secondly, the Churches which forsake the Communion of other Churches without just cause, do fall into Schisme: And if they  
swerve

swerve from the rule of faith, the other constantly hold, they become not only Schismaticall, but Hereticall. These are the severall kinds of Schisme. Thus Dr. Field. In which division he makes no mention of unjust excommunicators, or separators of others from the Church.

Dr. Potter. pag. 130.

The Novatians were Schismatiques by disobeying the publique determination of the Catholique Church in the generall Council of Nice. And Pag. 42. Sect 2. Num. 2. The Donatists did not only separate from the Church diffused throughout the world, &c. By which examples he declares the nature of Schisme, which he there treats; and though he adde to the Schisme of the Donatists, that they accounted the Catholique Church to be no true Church, and said, that the true Catholike Church, out of their Congregation, was perished; yet he never puts the clause of your definition, as a necessary ingredient; nor can hold with any consequence of doctrine, that the separation of the Donatists from the whole Catholique Church, alone was not sufficient to make them formal Schismatiques, (as you hold it is) because he sayes,

for the Catholiques definition. 187

sayes, That the Nestorians were Schismatiques, for disobeying the publique determination of the Catholique Church in the generall Councell of Nice,

Mr. Chillingworth.

pag. 166.

His Adversary having said, to forsake the externall Communion of them, with whom they agree in Faith is the most formall and proper sinne of Schisme. Master Chillingworth answers thus; very true.

And pag. 260.

To his Adversary affirming, that all Divines define Schisme, a division from the true Church, &c. he answers, I might very justly question your antecedent, and desire you to consider, whether Schisme be not rather, or at least be not as well, a division of the Church, as from it; a separation not of a part from the whole, but of the same parts from the other. Where though he seem to except against the second part of our definition, where we say, that Schisme is a separation from the whole Church; yet he both takes separation here, as we do, for a separation of ones self, and not of others; and supposes, that the true and  
pro-

proper notion of Schisme consists in a separation of *ones self*, either from the whole Church, or of one part separating it self from some other, and yet remaining *both within the Church*.

Note here, good Reader, that the *Catholique Disputants* never yet received any answer from their *Adversaries* to these *Authorities*.

**CHAP.**

CHAP. 3.

Wherein consists the proper Notion, or formal Reason, of Schisme.

**S**ECT. I. The proper Notion of Schisme delivered by both parts.

**S**EEING this said externall formality hath neither yet been proved, nor can possibly be conceived to be any other, then what we have put in our Definition, viz. Some reason involving a voluntary separation of our selves from the whole true visible Church of Christ, it serves for a most strong confirmation of the perfection of our Definition. For if the separation of ones self be not such a predicate as this, in relation to Schisme, we would gladly know what other single notion

notion can there be nominated, wherein the essence of schisme consists, and from which this of separation, &c. flows a propriety from an essential formality? We beseech you satisfy this difficulty.

We will lay down that, which shall together both further refute yours, and confirm our own definition, which we begin to do, by occurring to your confident perswasion, That the formality which renders an act Schismaticall cannot possibly be conceived to be any other (so are your words) then what you have put in your definition, viz. some reason involving a voluntary separation of our selves from the *Catholicque true visible Church of Christ*. This your conceit, that it cannot possibly be conceived to be any other, serves (you perswade your selves) for a most strong confirmation of the perfection of your definition. This if we now shew other, then what is in your conception and definition, then it is not impossible to be done, and we shall also satisfy you in what you desire of us, though we confute your definition. In brief then, the essential formality, or *formalis ratio*, of schism is that

uncha-



*uncharitableness, which is an injurious act of the Will (elicit or imperate) terminated to the violation of the Bond and Benefit of Ecclesiasticall externall Communion.* You have our sense, with humble submission herein to the judgement of the Church, or of the more learned. We desired before to give, as we said, as explicate and obvious a Definition, and as fully applicable to the practices of Schismatiques, as we could; and because explicate, therefore distinct also, and declarative of its comprehension of all the kinds of Schisme. But now that you press us to a more Metaphysicall Notion of its *ratio formalis*, we are content to try how you can disprove this now propounded: which if it be true (as we believe it is) your formall reason is not such, but partiall; and your Definition but partiall; and our Definition in nothing extended, or streightned by it; but in effect and equivalence of sense, in its *differentia constitutiva*, the same. For, first, injurious such act cannot be, nor an act of the Will, unless *voluntary*, and if it be voluntary doing what our definition mentions, it is alwayes an injurious violation (elicit

(elicitè or imperate) of the Bond and Benefit of Ecclesiasticall externall Communion; whether in the voluntary separating of our selves, injurious to the Church and to our selves, or in the unjust and tyrannicall thrusting, or casting out others from the Ecclesiasticall external Communion (more or lesse) injurious to those others their fellow members, and to the Church of Christ: Whether *Inferiours* thrusting out their Superiours, which is Ecclesiasticall Rebellion, or Sedition (as it is said, *Jeremiah 29. 25, 32. Because he hath taught Rebellion against the Lord*) or *Superiours* unjustly thrusting out their Inferiours; both these contrary to the Bond and Benefit of Communion, in that which each part ought to supply and enjoy of the Communion of Subordination respectively in the whole Church. Or, thirdly, *Equals* unjustly (either with want of sufficient cause also, or at least for want of sufficient authority, which they unjustly take to themselves, contrary to the order which is necessary to the unity of the Church) thrusting out their Equals, and so injuriously despoiling them of the Benefit of Ecclesiasticall Commu-

Communion; and contrary to the Bond of Communion of Coordination, which the arm owes to the arm, and the hand to the hand. He that separates any true part, or from any true part of the Body, or from the whole, is schismatically injurious to the unity and communion of the Body. Against this Communion of the Body in Schisme, the Will offends either by an internall elicit Act onely, or also by an externall imperate Act added; but still we say the Act, one or other, is terminated to the externall Communion of the Church, as here we expresse, and supposed before might be understood, where we spake of separating, or thrusting others from the Communion, which could not have place but in the Communion externall. So also when we mentioned sufficient Authority, viz. Ecclesiasticall, which hath place onely in *externo foro Ecclesiastico*: And also when we come to speak of our Definition, we have the right, which you have used, of explaining our selves in this or other particulars. The *formalis ratio*, which we have here above set down, agreeing in sense with the constitutive difference of our Defini-

tion, may yet also again (for further declaration of our self-same sense in other words) be thus expressed to you. The formality of Schisme is this, *An offence against that speciall Evangelicall Charity, whereby every member is obliged to all, carefully to eschew the violation of the Unity and Communion of the visible Church, or of the Priviledge and Benefit of each Member (in its proper place) in its being within that her external Communion.* This is the same in sense, as above: and since we are now in hand with variously expressing and declaring this one main important Point, the *formalis ratio* of Schisme, which you conceive you have (and we have proved, you have not) comprehended in your Definition, that we may shew you, how we study agreement with you, as far as possibly with truth we can, we will here set down, with what onely variations, even your Definition might for quietnesse sake have passed without our contradiction: As if you had said thus, or to this effect, *Schisme is a voluntary injurious separation of any one part (ones self, or other) from the Communion (wholly or in part) of the whole*  
true

*true visible Church of Christ, or of any true part thereof.* Not that we think you will like it thus, but that we may shew you, how we have meditated, and desired to finde how to like, if we could, what you say. As it is, there is a wide difference betwixt us; we have laid down, that the formality of Schisme is an offence, or breach, against that speciall Evangelicall Charity, whereby every member is obliged to all, carefully to eschew the violation of the Bond and Benefit of the unity and communion of the whole visible Church, or of the priviledges and benefits of each member (in its proper place) in its being within that her external communion. Here we have implied, as in the other description of the formality of Schisme, That Schisme is committed by any one Act, that violates the Bond and Benefit of Ecclesiasticall external Communion, due to any other member in its proper place in that Communion; therefore also by Superiours to Inferiours, (whether by injurious Excommunication, Interdict, or Suspension) or by Inferiours to Superiours, or Equals to Equals. This because you deny, and we

affirm, we will a little in this place insist to shew.

Where St. Paul saith, 1 Corinth. 12. ver. 18, 25. *Now hath God set the members, every one in the Body, as it hath pleased him. The Eye cannot say to the Hand, I have no need of thee, and the Head cannot say to the Feet, I have no need of you: but God hath tempered the Body together, that there should be no Schisme in the Body, but that the members should have the same care one for another.* Where St. Paul plainly teacheth us, that the members, not having the same care one for another, (as God hath placed each member in the Body, whether they be Superiours, Equals, or Inferiours) renders such members guilty of Schisme in the Body; and particularly he admonisheth Superiours, (lest the Schisme should at any time arise from them) that the Head cannot say to the Feet, *I have no need of you*; and the Eye cannot say to the Hand, *I have no need of thee.*

Secondly, Romans 16. 16, 17. *The Churches of Christ salute you. Now I beseech you, Brethren, mark those which cause divisions (τὰς τὰς διχονομίας ποιήσας)*  
and

and offences contrary to the Doctrine which you have learned, and avoid them; for they that are such, serve not our Lord Jesus Christ. This Text, both the evidence of the words and coherence shew, and the interpretation of the Fathers declare, to be spoken of Schismaticques: for as Sedition is *Διχομασία* in the State, so is Schisme in the Church; and from this *Διχομασία* in the Text, thus confessedly to be understood, we thus reason. Suppose we a while at least, that some Patriark, yea, or even the Bishop of Rome himself, with those that agree with him (if you will) excommunicates some whole Countrey, or Countreys of Christians unjustly, who persevere in that necessarily (as they judge) for which he excommunicates them unjustly, and he also persevere in holding them still separated by his continued unjust Excommunication, here is made an evident and notorious rent, division, and *Διχομασία* in the Church; whosoever made it, are by St Paul in this Text, Rom. 16. 16, 17. argued of Schisme, in the Fathers interpretation of this Text; and by the Apostle expressly said, *not to serve our Lord Jesus Christ.* For mark,



saith he, *vis. propter*, &c. Those that make the Divisions, or that cause the Divisions amongst you, such serve not our Lord Jesus. Here then in this supposed case, since there is a division, disunion, and renting of the continuity of the Body, which was before entire, there is surely a Schisme, or rent in the Church; and this must be made by some or other, and he or they that made or caused it, are schismaticall. But the acknowledged innocent Christians, that are unjustly excommunicated (as our *Hypothesis* here doth suppose them) can in no sense be said to have made, or caused the Division; Therefore such Patriarch, or even the Bishop of *Rome* himself did make, or cause, the Division, (for no persons else intervene in our *Hypothesis*) and consequently such Superior in such unjust Excommunication was schismaticall.

If here you reply, but the Pope (who, haply you will say is Head of the Church) cannot possibly excommunicate whole Countreys unjustly, (whether he hath or no, will come to be considered in the question it self, *viz.* Whether the Papacy, or our Countrey agreeing with the Church

Church of *England*, be guilty of the Schisme, and Rent which is betwixt them) we here susteine that it is possible, and would gladly know, whether you deny it, and so have that as a Reserve to secure you: That you in adhering to the Pope in all his Excommunications of so many Churches, are not schismaticall. because it is impossible you should be so. But tell us what you say in this by your next. However our Argument alike proceeds in any other Patriark, who, we believe, you will acknowledge, may excommunicate some whole Countrey of Christians unjustly: and then suppose he do so, we have proved he doth schismatically, and let his resolution of not standing out therein against the Council, or other Superiour, (if he had any) be what it will, in the mean time he hath confessedly made, or caused *αἰσχρότητα*, Division and Rent in the Church, (for no other in this case could) and consequently he is schismaticall, *and serves not the Lord Jesus, but his own belly* *διὰ τὸν κοιλίαν*. Thirdly, this our Doctrine of Schisme, that it is also a Superiours unjust excommunication of the Brethren, seems to us

to be evident upon our Lords words to St. Peter, *Luc. 12. 41, 46. Mat. 24. 43, &c.* The Servant, or Steward there, (be it St. Peter there, to whom the Lord spake these words, or any successour, or also any of his Brethren) whom Christ our Lord makes Ruler over his household, to give them their portion of meat in due season; if he shall begin to beat the men-servants and maidens, his fellow-servants in the house; (whiles himself eats and drinks drunk with the drunken) he that so falls a beating, &c. may he not possibly, and probably sometimes, beat some faithfull servant of them out of doors, and that possibly sure, because they will not in that eating and drinking drunk communicate with the other wicked servants and such their stewards set over them? If now that steward will not allow some of them to communicate any longer at all in that House, unlesse they will communicate in that riotous eating and drinking, but beat them, and thrust them forth of doors; Is, or is not, such beating and thrusting out, excommunicating or depriving those faithfull servants of that household Communion, which was

was their due, a criminal Act of Schisme, or renting of Christs Household? Or is it another sin onely, and not at all any criminall renting of Christs Household by Schisme?

Fourthly, what is *σχίσμα*, Schisme, but a Rent of the unity and continuity (as it were of that Body which before was entire.) Now that none should be guilty of wounding by dividing, or criminally renting that Body, which before was entire, but onely that member which cuts off it self, and not that which cuts off others, many more and more excellent members then it self, (for all this often happens in a Superiors unjust excommunication of others) is unreasonable and unnaturall to averre. If any one, whose office it is to judge of living and dead Members, shall cut off any dead member from the Body, he doth nothing but what such member, placed in such place in the Body, ought to do, and what is profitable to the whole Body; But if he cut off many living and sound members of the Body, is he not more injurious to the unity of the Body, (which unity of the Body St. *Paul* makes his reason, why

Schismes must be avoided, *Ephes.* 4. 3, 4, 5, 6. *1 Cor.* 12. 12, 25.) then if he cut off himself. And if he cut off any one living member of the Body, he is injurious to the unity of the Body, and rents that voluntarily and unjustly, which before was one and entire.

If by this time we have shewen, that the *formall reason* is such, as includes those also, which unjustly excommunicate and separate others from the Churches Communion, (as we believe we have) then there were no Philosophy in saying to another, That when any unjust Excommunication, Interdict, &c. is denominated schismaticall, the unjust Excommunication, &c. is to the Schisme, oney as a piece of wood is to an Image. For every one doth know, that the wood is the matter onely, the artificiall figure made to represent some one, is the form of that which is denominated Image. Semblably whereto, voluntary separation of one part from the whole Body of the visible Church of Christ (which was at first all your Definition of Schisme) is but the *materiale* of Schisme; and consequently not our instance of unjust Excommunication,

cation or Separation, of others, but your whole Definition (as at first) is but the wooden part of the Image: and the voluntary uncharitable violation of the Bond and Benefit of Ecclesiasticall Communion, is the form of that which is denominated properly Schisme: which *formale* in a voluntary unjust Excommunication of others, is essentially inseparable from the unjust Excommunication of others, *quatenus tale*, as it is an unjust Excommunication of others.

C. 2

*The formal reason of Schisme is delivered by you in three different places, that it might be, I suppose, sufficiently understood by us, and remembered by the Auditors. The two first Conceptions of it are the very same; the third something different; we will examine them all.*

*You say Pag. 21. the essential formality, or formalis ratio, of Schisme, is that uncharitableness, which is an injurious Act of the Will (elicit or imperate) terminated to the violation of the Bond and Benefit of Ecclesiasticall externall Communion. Thus you. Against this formalis ratio we argue thus. First, it seems*

to us obscure, and so (considered onely in it self) needs a further and more explicite delivery. For, first, it appears not what kinde of violation you mean; whether an imperfect or incomplete violation onely, which admits in the violatour a reserve of obedience and resignation to break off that violation, and restore again the person injured by it to his former Communion, &c. when he shall be commanded by his lawfull Superiours to desist: Or you mean a complete absolute, entire, and obstinate violation, continued by the violatour, even when he is lawfully commanded by his Superiours to cease from it. If the later onely, you say no more then what we have already asserted, and what is evident to be Schisme. For such a violatour, by contemning and rejecting the lawfull commands of his legall Superiours, breaks and rents himself, from the whole Church, and so falls under our Definition. If the former also, which seems to be your meaning by your ensuing Illustrations and Proofs, you appear to us, both to speake improperly (which is not allowable in expressions of formall reason;) for that is said onely to be a violation of any thing, which entirely  
and



and ultimately destroyes it; and to deliver a false formality of Schisme, as we shall see presently. Secondly, This your formall reason is obscure, because it appears not from the precise words, whether you intend in these words, Of the Bond and Benefit of Ecclesiasticall externall Communion, in a conjunctive onely, or also in a disjunctive sense; that is, that to be Schisme, it must be a violation of both the one and the other; or of either of them apart. So that the particle *and* relates to violation; that is, that Schisme is terminated to a violation of the Bond, and to a violation of the Benefit of externall Communion also, when the Bond is not violated. Now this latter you declare hereafter sufficiently to be your meaning; both when, in your other expression of the formall reason of Schisme, you say, pag. 22. A violation of the Unity and Communion of the visible Church; or of the Priviledge and Benefits of each member, &c. And pag. 23. That Schisme is committed, whether by injurious Excommunication, (*which violates in your sense the Bond*) Interdict, or Suspension, *which can onely violate the Priviledge, or Benefits*

fits of externall Communion, and not the Bond it self.

These obscurities thus examined, and compared with the Context of your other words, till you give us a contrary exposition, we shall dispute against this your formall reason, understanding you to mean by violation, both a compleat and consummate violation, as we have explained it, and withall any incompleat and subordinate violation of the said Bond, &c. And by Bond and Benefit we understand them in a disjunctive sense, that each a part being violated, without the violation of the other, Schisme is committed. Against this sense of your formall reason we oppose these ensuing Reasons.

First, We oppose the plain Authorities of those holy Ancient Fathers, whom we have cited in our last Paper in confirmation of our Definition; who say, That every Schisme separates the Schismaticke from the whole visible Church, and that all Schismatiques are as truly out of the visible Church, as Heretiques are: which according to this your formall reason will not be true. For one may injuriously deprive another of some benefit of the Bond of  
Externall

externall Communion, v. gr. by unjust Suspension, Interdict, Minor, or lesser Excommunication, Deposition, Degradation, &c. without becoming thereby no part of the visible Church; as we have proved by our reasons brought against your consequentiall separation of an unjust Excommunicatour from the Church; and which you cannot avoid, if you understand, that separation to be made from the visible Church.

Secondly, We oppose the practice of the Ancient Church: For, as Baronius notes, Anno 406. Num. 5. and cites St. Chrysostome, Epist. 2. ex 7. Tom. 5. opera ejus. Extat. etiam Tom. 1. Epist. Rom. Pontif. post Innocent. Epist. 16. Saint Chrysostome writ to Innocentius, interceding for those who had deposed him unjustly, in these words: Suasit mitius agere adversus Canonum proculcatores, ne ab Ecclesie Communione ob periculum universalis in toto orbe conflandi Schismatis, eos expellat, sed expectat, si fortè resipiscant. He perswaded him, that he would deal more mildly with the despisers of the holy Canons, that he would not expell them from the Communion of the Church, by reason of the danger of occasioning a Schisme through

throughout the whole world; but that he would expect. to see if they would haply repent. And it appears, they were no more Schismaticques at that time esteemed by Innocentius then St. Chrysostome was; because Innocentius admitted them both equally to Communion: which had not been lawfull, as appears by the proceeding of Felix and the Roman Council in the case of Acacius Bishop of Constantinople; who becoming a Schismaticque by communicating with Heretiques, was deprived of Communion; and not onely he, but also the Apostolicall Legates sent to him, Vitalls and Misenus, for communicating with him. Liberat. cap. 18. Tom. 2. Concil. in Felice 3<sup>o</sup>. Nicephorus lib. 16. cap. 17, Martyr. Roman. 8. Februarii. Gelasius Epist. 11. ad Dardanum. Evagr. lib. 3. cap. 22. & alii.

Thirdly, We oppose your Definition of Schisme to this your formall reason; which is this. Schisme is any voluntary renting, or separating our selves, or without sufficient authority, without sufficient cause, separating and thrusting others, what lies in us; or also causing, following, or allowing any of such aforesaid separations

ons from the Unity and Communion of the one Body of Christ; or of any true part of that body, in that which every one ought to supply towards other of Communion, whether of Coordination, or Subordination respectively. Now we demand, what word, or particle is there in this Definition, which includes a violation of the Priviledge and Benefit of each member (in its proper place) in its being within her (the Churches) external Communion, as disjunct from the violation of the Bond of Communion it self; such as is an unjust Suspension, or Interdict, &c. which you comprize expressly in this your Formall reason, pag. 23. and with which the Bond of externall Communion stands unviolated, as all know? If therefore you cannot design any such particle in your Definition, (as we assure our selves you cannot) you must either acknowledge, that your Definition is not perfect, as not containing the whole Formall reason of the Definitum; or that the sole violation of the Benefit, and not of the Bond of externall Communion, is not a part of the Formall reason of Schisme.

Fourthly, We oppose the Novelty of  
this

this your formall reason of Schisme, and require of you to cite any *Classique Authors*, Ancient or Modern, yours or ours, who have given a formall notion, or formality of Schisme; comprehending the violation of the sole Benefit of externall Communion; the Bond it self still remaining unviolated; and comprizing under it unjust Suspension, Interdict, &c. as you acknowledge yours does: and if this cannot be done by you, it will seem very strange, if not incredible, that amongst so many thousands of learned men, some whereof have expressly treated of Schisme, none should have understood aright the formall reason, or true nature of it, before you.

Fifthly, we oppose the Acceptation of Schisme, in which we took it, when we began this Conference; and wherein we were understood to dispute by the whole Auditory: which was of Schisme, as it is usually taken both in the Ancient Fathers and approved Authors on both sides; and lately by Dr. Hammond, viz. in its proper and strict sense, or in its distinct notion, for that horrid sinne of Schisme, which the Fathers say, is greater then the sin of Tradition of the holy Bible to Heathens, then Idolatry, Sacri-

*Sacriledge, Parricide, as bad as Heresie, the peculiar mark of Gods indignation, serving the Devil, Antichristianisme, &c. which Dr. Hammond affirms and proves by the Authorities of the Ancient Fathers, in his Book of Schisme, pag. 6, 7, 8, 9. In this, and no other sense save this, we treated it; and so are obliged on both sides to treat it in no other, save this. Now what ratiōnall man will say, that a Bishop injuriously suspending some Priest of his Diocese, or unjustly interdicting some Village, or Community, in his Bishoprick, commits a sin, worse then Idolatry, Sacriledge, Parricide, is as bad as an Heretique, becomes an Antichristian, &c. even whilest he is so great a lover of Unity and hater of Schisme, that he is in a preparation of mind to revoke those unjust censures, whensoever he shall be commanded to revoke them, by his lawfull superiours.*

*Sixthly, We oppose, even comprehending the incompleat violation of the Bond of Communion, by unjust, or injurious, Excommunication, the common apprehension, which all understanding Christians have, and ever have had, of this horrid sinne of Schisme, in its proper and strict acceptiōn;*  
*which*



which is, that every one who is guilty of Schisme is a Schismaticque; and that Schismaticque is a term contradistinct to Catholique. Thus was it understood in the time of the Novatians, Donatists, Acacians, Luciferians, &c. amongst all the Catholique Doctours of those ages: And we require, that any Ancient Father, or Orthodox Author be produced, who ever named any Schismaticques, whom they esteemed Catholiques; or termed any Catholiques, whilest they remained Schismaticques: which notwithstanding you must acknowledge to be true in your opinion. For seeing the imperfect violation of the Bond of externall Communion, (according to you) in an injurious Excommunication of others, separates not the unjust Excommunicator from the externall Communion of the visible Church, he still remains a true member of the visible Church, and within her externall Communion: And therefore is, and so may be truly stiled a Catholique; and yet whilest he remains thus a true Catholique, by his unjust Excommunication he becomes guilty of Schisme (according to you) and by that a Schismaticque: so that at the same  
time

time he is a true Catholique, and a true Schismaticque; which according to all Christian Antiquity is as impossible, as to be a true professed Heretique and a Catholique at the same time: which truth is most emphatically delivered by St. Augustine, Tom. 3. De Fide & Symbolo, cap. 10. Credimus sanctam Ecclesiam, utique Catholicam. Nam & Heretici & Schismatici congregationes suas Ecclesias vocant: sed Heretici de Deo falsa sentiendo ipsam fidem violant; Schismatici autem discissionibus iniquis à fraternâ charitate diffiliunt, quamvis ea credunt, quæ credimus. Quapropter nec Hereticus pertinet ad Ecclesiam Catholicam, quoniam non diligit Deum; nec Schismaticus, quoniam non diligit proximum. We believe (*saith this holy Father*) the holy Church, to wit, the Catholique. For even Heretiques and Schismaticques term their Congregations Churches: but Heretiques by teaching false things of God, violate the faith; and Schismaticques refile, or go back, from fraternall Charity, although they believe those things which we believe: wherefore neither belongs an Heretique to the Catholique

lique Church, because he loves not God; nor a Schismaticke, because he loves not his neighbour. Thus Saint Augustine. Where he sayes in expresse terms, That a Schismaticke belongs no more to the Catholique Church, then an Heretique: But whosoever belongs not to the Catholique Church, so long as he belongs not to it, cannot with truth be termed a true Catholique. Therefore your formal reason of Schisme, admitting any Schismaticke to be truly termed a Catholique, is not a true formal reason of Schisme.

\* Note here, that we have not received any direct Answer to these Reasons, yet the Adversaries prosecute the Notion of Schisme in the manner following.

## P. 2.

Our fourth Proposition, that as in the first and third Proposition was said, That Schisme (as all other sin) when committed deliberately, knowingly, against conscience, is alwayes criminall and mortall, and destructive of salvation: so when it is so committed, compared with other sins, it is of a transcendent high malignity and guilt above most others sins. Where  
twere

'twere obvious and easie to heap up, out of the Ancients, endless citations: But that having been done already and often, as it were by every writer on this subject, we will omit such Citations, and chuse rather to demonstrate it, *à priori*, why it is, when so committed as we have described, of so transcendent high guilt and malignity; briefly for these Reasons *à priori*.

C. 3.

*You are much out in the Parenthesis of this Proposition, viz. (as all other sin;) for a Veniall sin, by reason of the lightnesse of the matter of it may be committed deliberately, knowingly, against conscience, and yet thereby become no criminall and mortall sin, destructive of salvation; as all Divines know.*

P. 3.

First, because it is sin, against both Tables, and against Law and Gospel; it is a sin, not onely against our neighbour, against the good of our neighbour, but against the greatest good of our neighbour, against the chiefest means of the chiefest (*b. e.*) the spirituall good of our neighbour.

C. 4.

## C. 4.

*This first reason will make deliberate Schisme no greater sin, then are many other sins, which work against the spirituall good of our neighbour; and so proves not, that therefore Schisme is of a transcendent high malignity and guilt above most other sins, which you undertake to prove by it.*

## P. 4.

And secondly; Because not onely against the chiefest, (*b. e.*) the spirituall good of this or that particular neighbor, but usually (yea, alwayes in some degree) against a Community, or Society of our neighbours; (for he that cuts off one lively member by manifestly injurious abscession, sins against the Body and Community also) as they are most happily, by Gods great mercy, grace, and calling, associated together in that Community and Society; which is far the most excellent, supereminent, and durable in the world: against the Church, as a Church; against it in its Union and Communion in the greatest good and strictest band, and firmest foundation of all society, in the way leading it to eternall happiness; and

as

as it is united also in communion and unity with the glorious society of the Church Triumphant in Heaven, and with God himself, and with Christ the Son of God.

## C. 5.

Your second Reason we admit not, as applied to the unjust Excommunication of others: For the depriving wrongfully the Church of the communion of such a member, by the power of some Prelate, who lives still in the visible communion and unity of the Church, and is ready to receive again that excommunicated person, when he shall be effectually commanded to receive him, by his lawfull Superiours, hath no more of true Schisme in it, then the depriving the Commonwealth wrongfully of some loyall and profitable member by unjust banishment, by power of some high Officer, or Viceroy, ready to recall him again from banishment, so soon as he shall be commanded by the Chief Magistrate to do it, hath of Rebellion and Sedition. Though therefore this unjust banishment be a wrong done both to the person banished, and to the Commonwealth deprived of so good a member; yet no Author calls it Sedition, but Oppres-

sion; nor Rebellion, but Tyranny: so though the like wrong be done by this unjust Excommunication, both to the party excommunicated, and to the Church deprived of so true a member; yet no man can rightly term it Schisme, but Spirituall Tyranny, and high oppression. Seeing therefore, according to the holy Fathers, and other Authors cited by us in the second Chapter, all proper Schisme is a Spirituall Sedition and Rebellion, against the visible Church and her Prelates, by those, who having been before lawfull Subjects, it is not every wrong which is done to the Church and her Members, even in her Communion with them, which makes Schisme, but such onely, where there is found a seditious and rebellious party, standing in open opposition and defiance of the Church, and her Communion, and raising a new separate Body amongst themselves, independent of her, under the appellation of Christians; and destroying the unity of the Church, and making a division against her.

P. 5.

Thirdly, because it disunites the soul of the divider, or Schismaticque, from that God and that Christ, in regard of its perfectest



fectest union : the understanding being united unto God by a right faith, knowledge, remembring and meditating on him ; the will by trust and hope, but principally by love. Disunited therefore is the understanding by want of knowledge, by infidelity, by heresie, or by forgetting of God : the will by ungodlinesse, unrighteousness, schisme, and inordinate love. Now Schisme is the violation of that speciall love, which Christ came into the world specially to establish (the love especially of the household of faith) by his new Evangelicall law of love. *A new commandment give I unto you, that ye love one another: h.e. ye his disciples love his disciples ; and such all true Christians are ; and of such is the Churches Communion made up.*

## C. 6.

*Your third reason of disuniting from God the Understanding, Will, &c. even in this love of Church Communion, &c. if by Communion you understand Unity, we admit; if it be a full and compleat destruction of love of that Communion, or Unity: But this can never happen by force of a sole unjust excommunication, as we shall presently see.*

## P. 6.

Nor may you object, or pretend this superfluous for us to advertise you of: for we prove it most materiall to be said here to you; First, because all these three Reasons of the transcendent and hainous guilt of Schisme, (which you cannot but acknowledge to be true reasons thereof) when committed, as aforesaid, do as truly agree, to the properly, formally, manifestly unjust cutting off the live members of Chrills my stical body, (especially when whole Churches are so injuriously cut off) which you would excuse from Schisme, though condemn as tyranny, and we condemn as formal, criminal, and mortal Schisme also; as they do to him, that voluntarily separates himself from the true visible Church of Christ, (which is your onely Schismaticque)

## C. 7.

*We deny your parity, and your consequence drawn from it. For cutting off another by unjust Excommunication, includes in it formally no spirituall Sedition, nor Rebellion, and so no proper Schisme; but separation of ones self (whereof we now speake) from the whole Church, includes formally*

*formally such a Sedition and Rebellion; and therefore is alwayes Schisme.*

*P. 7.*

Secondly, because those three Reasons now given (which you cannot but acknowledge to be true) doe evidence, that your often assigned formall reason of Schisme, viz. *Contempt of Catholique Communion*, (which *Contempt* you interpret to be something, which is not found in a properly, formally, and manifestly unjust Excommunication of others, as *such*) is too narrow a measure, whereby you let passe by, and escape from all guilt of Schisme, a great and hainously guilty number of Schismatiques.

*C. 8.*

*We deny that narrownesse of our formall reason of Schisme; or that it lets slip any one guilty of proper Schisme, as Schisme is treated by the holy Fathers: and you onely say, but prove not here, that it is too narrow.*

*P. 8.*

Now these Reasons do shew, that not onely contempt of Catholique Communion, but all want of the truth of love of Catholique Communion, the want, we

say, not onely of some degrees, but of the truth of the love of it, in men professing Christianity, whether it be from contempt of it, or from hatred of it, or envy of it, or loving it lesse then some worldly honour, dominion, pleasure, or profit; (whereas we are not said usually to *contemne* all things, which we envy, or love lesse then somewhat, that we injuriously *preferre*) all want, we say, again, of the truth of the love of Catholique Communion, proceeding to an act elicit or imperate of violation, or lesion, of externall Ecclesiasticall Communion doth, as truly and alwayes evince such sinne against Catholique Communion to be Schisme, as Contempt of it doth: yea, we adde, that yet you may be pleased with us, coming up close to you, to joyn in that issue, which, you say, you do desire; Such *want of the truth of the love of Catholique Communion, and not contempt of it*, doth evince such violation of externall Catholique Communion, as doth proceed from it, to be alwayes Mortall Criminall Schisme.

## C. 9.

We are most willing to joyn with you, as far as Christian Truth will permit us; and therefore freely grant you, that whensoever the truth of the love of Catholique Communion is wanting, if by Communion you understand Unity) there is Schisme, as much as you do, and that it is a very near disposition to Schisme: But we must confesse, that we cannot by any means understand, how a Prelate living actually in Catholique Communion and Unity, and intending fully to live and dye in it, with a preparation of minde to receive again into the Church, whomsoever through private spleen or envy, he hath unjustly excommunicated, when he shall be lawfully commanded to do it, can truly be said to want the truth of the love of Catholique Communion, i. e. Catholique Unity, though he want many degrees of the perfection of it. For what can there be imagined to preserve him thus solidly and sincerely in that Communion and Unity with the Church, save a true love of it? or how can it possibly be conceived, that he could be ready to depose his private envy, and revoke his unjust act, rather then

separate himself by an universall Rebellion against the lawfull commands of his Ecclesiasticall Superiours, from Catholique Communion and Unity, if he did not really and truly love it? Till therefore you demonstrate, that such a Prelate hath no true respect, regard, or care at all, to conserve himself in Catholique communion and unity, (which will never follow from the sole malice of an unjust Excommunication of others) you cannot convince, that he wants the truth of the love of Catholique Communion and Unity. But if you mean onely, that want of the truth of the love of Catholique communion, which may consist with the truth of the love of Catholique Unity, you deceive your self, when you say, that it is alwayes a proxima dispositio to Schisme: For an excommunicated person, by a just Excommunication, who remains for a long time obstinately under Excommunication, may be truly said to want the truth of the love of Catholique Communion, in that sense wherein you seem to take it; that is, as Communion is distinguished from Unity, and yet he is neither Schismaticque, nor in an immediate disposition to be a Schismaticque: and the reason is, that though he want the truth

truth of the love of Catholique Communion in this sense, yet he retains the truth of the love of Catholique Unity; that is, he is wholly resolved not to destroy the Unity of the Church, by dividing himself seditiously and rebelliously from her, and siding with others against her.

P. 9.

And yet when all this is said, we do not say of the want of the truth of the love of Catholique Communion, (as you do of the Contempt of it) that it is the *formalis ratio* of Schisme. For both it may be without Schisme, (in that many men may want the truth of the love of Catholique Communion, that neither have a will to separate themselves from the externall Communion, nor injuriously to thrust, or cut off others from it;) and Schisme may be without it; viz. such Schisme, as proceeds from the sinfull want of some due and bounden degrees of the love of Catholique Communion, but not from the want of the truth of Love of Catholique Communion. We have before proved, and given instances from your selves, that there may be some Schisme in some abused persons,

L 5

from



from some zeal not according to knowledge, and yet not from crasse, and affected, or mortally sinfull ignorance, or blindenesse; which erroneous Zeale may lodge in the heart, wherein is the truth of the love of Catholique Communion, however the love be defective in some degrees. How be it, no mortall and criminall Schisme can be without it; viz. without the want of the true love of Catholique Communion: nor Schisme, if from that root, can be otherwise then mortall and criminall; nor any Schisme at all, without some defect of some degrees of the love of Catholique Communion.

C. 10.

We deny, that any Schisme whatsoever (as Schisme is understood by the holy Fathers) can consist with the truth of the Love of Catholique Communion: and if such Schisme can be, then (which we before objected to you) though you could prove us formall Schismatiques in some true sense, according to your Principles, yet it would not follow, that we were criminall, mortall Schismatiques; and so, notwithstanding that light Schisme, we might be saved.

P. 10.

## P. 10.

Therefore in our assignation of the *formalis ratio* of Schisme, though we delivered it thirteen severall wayes of expressing our selves, yet we did not deliver it to be that, *The want of the truth of the love of Catholique communion*; nor could we have done it with truth: But according to us, the *formalis ratio* of Schisme was that *uncharitablenesse*, which is an *injurious act of the Will* (elicit or imparate) terminated to the violation of externall Ecclesiasticall Communion; or, (which is all one) to the violation of the bond and benefit of Ecclesiasticall externall Communion. Now all *uncharitablenesse* is not necessarily the want of the truth of Charity, but of some degrees of it: for all sin also not mortall, is ever from some defect in love. Secondly, the want of sufficient love of Catholique Communion is alwayes the *causa proxima*, though not the *formalis ratio*, of Schisme. Thirdly, the want of sufficient love of Catholique Communion, is alwayes the *causa proxima*, though not the *formalis ratio* of Criminall Mortall Schisme.

## C. 11.

## C. .11.

What is here said, is either answered already, or makes nothing against us.

## P. 11.

And for the same reason also, we, who do affirm against you, That not onely contempt of Catholique Communion, but also all want of the truth of the love of Catholique Communion, renders the violation of Catholique Communion criminall and mortall Schisme, as well as the contempt of it : yet we advertise you, that neither you can with truth call the contempt of Catholique Communion, according to your Principles, the *formalis ratio* of Schisme: For the *formalis ratio* of Schisme cannot be without Schisme; nor Schisme, without its *formalis ratio*. But there may be contempt (which is first and principally an act of the Heart) of Catholique Communion, where the contemner doth not voluntarily separate himself from the whole true visible Church, (which is your definition of Schisme.) For a man may continue to live in that which he contemns. A person may despise those with whom, and that society in which he doth continue daily  
to

to converse: A man may have no will to separate himself from being a member of that Society, Body, or Community, whose Communion yet he doth in his heart despise and contemne; and may haply sometime not spare to say so. So that if this our discourse cannot be by you denied, (as we believe it cannot) either your definition of Schisme is not a true definition; or your *formalis ratio* of Schisme not the true *formalis ratio*; or the *formalis ratio* of your Schisme defined, would be possible to be, where neither the *Definitum*, nor the Definition were; of both which yet the *formalis ratio* is still the essence. But as to our assignation of *the want* of the truth of love of Catholique Communion, as a surer *κρηττόν* of mortall Schisme in the Divider, then yours of *the Contempt* of Catholique Communion; you may haply reply, that you sometime put two words together, and say *the hatred and contempt* of Catholique Communion, you do so indeed: but when you require *hatred and contempt* both to concur where no mortall Schisme is, you do not declare, that anything without contempt fills up the reason,

reason, but rather the contrary. Yet if you will now or hereafter declare to us, that you mean either contempt, or even hatred alone of Catholique Communion sufficeth to the formall reason, we will accept of it; and not think it manly to pursue to criticize, as you do ten lines together upon our words, (*The violation of the bond and benefit of Ecclesiasticall Communion*) telling us that we speak obscurely; because it appears not, say you, from the precise words, whether we intend in those words (*of the bond and benefit of Ecclesiasticall Communion*) in a conjunctive onely, or also in a disjunctive sense; (which we spake directly and simply in a conjunctive sense, as our conjunctive particle there expressed did signifie:) we use disjunctives, when we speak disjunctively; and conjunctives, when we mean conjunctively; yet you will needs understand our words there in a sense disjunctive, from conjectures, which we will refute, when we are come to speak to it. Mean while, as to your words, as obscure and ambiguous sure, *the hatred and contempt of Catholique Communion,*

*munion*, affix you one sense or other, which you please. If you say that *hatred* alone, though not *contempt* of Catholique Communion, adjoynd to the unjust Excommunicators unjust Excommunication of others, renders it formally and mortally schismaticall; then we must again demand of you, whether you do intend, that all want of the truth of the love of Catholique Communion in Christians, is as it were, interpretively *hatred* of it; (if you think fit so to speak, you may) then we immediately in this very place joyn issue with you upon the whole question betwixt us, and professe, this whole Controversie (if you will) may be ended in this hour.

## C. 12.

*All this discourse is a meer stranger to the Constitution of our formalis ratio, or proper notion of Schisme. For we neither constitute it in an internall contempt, nor hatred of Catholique Communion, but in a voluntary separation from the whole Church of Christ; which is the essence of Schisme delivered in our Definition.*

finition. And therefore we often repeat, that the formall reason of Schisme cannot possibly be conceived to consist in any thing, save a separation of ones self from the whole Church: which saying of ours, gave occasion to this whole Controversie of the formalis ratio, as you know, and as appears in the beginning of this Chapter. And when we name contempt or hatred, we take it for a complete contempt or hatred, both in the internall and externall acts: and therefore we joyn not onely contempt and hatred together, (as you observe) which may be true of the internall acts onely; but which you might as easily have observed, had you pleased) we joyn contempt and relinquishing, contempt and rejection, contempt, hatred, and separation of one from Catholique Communion together: which shew evidently, that we not onely speak of an externall and complete contempt, but of such a contempt, as is an externall relinquishing, and rejecting of Catholique Communion and Unity. And when we, after these explications of our sense, name contempt alone, it is for brevity's sake; supposing, that we had made our selves sufficiently to be understood,



stood, what we meant by it, to such as were willing to understand us.

P. 12.

For (for the love of God) tell us, whether you do not believe, as well as we, that in every properly, formally, manifestly unjust Excommunication of others, *as such*, in *sensu formali*, as it is a proper, manifest, unjust Excommunication of others, (not onely as it is an injustice, but as it is an unjust Excommunication; and that is that our Definition requires to be included; not every injustice, but every proper formally manifest unjust Excommunication) whether (we say) every such, *as such*, doth not alwayes include in its bowels, the want of the truth of love of Catholique Communion? if not, then he that so mortally sins (as you acknowledge) by cutting off manifestly unjustly a live Member of Christs mysticall Body from Catholique Communion, doth not mortally sin against Catholique Communion; or though he do, yet may have the truth of the love of Catholique Communion in him; which is certainly false, as it is a confessed Catholique truth, That all mortall sin against any, ever proceeds

proceeds from the want of the truth of love of that, against which the mortall sinne is committed. For surely *Charitas*, or the truth of love of God, our Neighbour, or of Catholique Communion, cannot possibly consist with mortall sinne against God, our Neighbour, or of Catholique Communion: if yea, *h. e.* if you acknowledge, that every properly, formally, manifestly unjust Excommunication of others, *as such*, includes in it alwayes the want of the truth of love of Catholique Communion; and yield before, (as was supposed above) that the want of the truth of the love of Catholique Communion, be the same with what you call *the barred* of Catholique Communion; and that be the *formalis ratio* of Schisme, then let any judge, whether this question be not in this very instant ended, in that it is now agreed betwixt us, That every formall proper confessed unjust Excommunication of others, *as such*, hath in it alwayes that which renders it necessarily formall Schisme, (*viz. want of the truth of the love of Catholique Communion*) and so is formally Schisme.

## C. 13.

The love of God ought to make us both do, and suffer much; and we hope, will: yet it cannot incline us to do what we truly conceive to be contrary to the love of God. We answer therefore to your demand, that every Major Excommunication, which is unjust, is a mortall sin against the Justice and Charity, which we owe to our Neighbour, but not necessarily against the truth of the love of Catholique Communion, even though you understand it onely (as you seem to do) of Actual Communion; with which may consist the truth of the love of Catholique Unity: For it may so happen, that because one hath so strong a love to Catholique Communion himself, and so great an esteem of it, the hatred and envy, which the unjust Excommunicator bears against him, whom he excommunicates unjustly, is the cause, that he deprives him of so great a good; and the greater that he esteems that good, the more he is carried by his hatred to the person, to deprive him of it. Thus a Governor of a Countrey may unjustly banish an innocent person, because he envies him the happiness of that Commonwealth, which he himself

self loves most tenderly : Thus excess of hatred may transport one to deprive another of the joyes of heaven, though he love them passionately himself. Seeing therefore the unjust deprivors of others, whether it be of Heaven, or of the society of some flourishing Commonwealth, or of Church Communion, may spring formally and directly from a hatred to the persons so deprived, and not from a want of love and esteem of that, whereof they deprive them, it can never be gathered from an unjust excommunication, *quatalis*, that it destroyes the truth of the love of that Communion, whereof out of private hatred he deprives another: which is sufficient to answer your demand.

If you should press your objection further, that the unjust Excommunicator cannot but see, that by reason of his unjust Excommunication, not onely the person excommunicated, but the Church also it self, is notably injured, and so must sin mortally, not onely against the person excommunicated, but against the Church, in injuring her in her Communion, and depriving her wrongfully of one of her true members; I answer, first, that as a Kingdome or  
Common-

Commonwealth esteemes not it self mortally injured, when some private persons are unjustly outlawed, or banished; so long as he who did it, is ready to restore them, when upon just complaint he shall be lawfully commanded to do it: so neither esteems the Church, that it is an mortall injury to her, to sejoyn for a time from her actnall Communion, unjustly, some persons, when the unjust Excommunicatour is in the like disposition of restoring them. We answer, secondly, That though by unjust Excommunication, by reason of the great multitudes, who may be excommunicated, or otherwise, the Church may be grievously injured by depriving her of her Communion with them, yet the Unity of the Church remains still entire; because there is no breach of Unity committed, neither by the unjust Excommunicatour, nor by the unjustly excommunicated; they living both peaceably, and acknowledging the due authority of their Superiours. Now you seem to us to be deceived in this, as we touched above, viz. That all violation of the external Communion, which proceeds from want of the truth of the love of Catholique Communion, is criminall and mortall Schisme,

Schisme, even when that want of the truth of the love of Catholique Communion consists with the truth of the love of Catholique Unity. For it is the love of Catholique Unity, and not of Communion, which is contrary to Schisme. A person, who being Canonically admonished under pain of Excommunication, permits himselfe to fall into Excommunication, violates externall Communion; and this proceeds from a want of the truth of the love of Catholique Communion: and yet he is no Schismaticke, because he still remains peaceably in Catholique Unity, and acknowledgement of his Superiours, and makes no division from them. For Schisme is a destruction of Unity, and not of actuall Communion onely; as all understand: and if you had seriously reflected on this truth, this whole dispute might have been prevented. For actuall Catholique Communion alone, is onely an exercise of Catholique Unity; but Catholique Unity is the root and ground of it; and as long as that Unity remains unviolated, there can be no Schisme, though the Communion be not actually exercised: For nothing but Separation and  
Divi-

Division of one thing into parts, or of parts from the whole, can destroy the Unity of any thing; and so long as the Unity of the whole remains, it is not possible to conceive a Division of that, which is one thing, into parts, or one part divided from the whole. Seeing therefore Schisme is a Rent, or Division of that Unity, and of nothing else, so long as that Unity remains, whether exercised or no by actual Communion, there cannot possibly be any Schisme. For Schisme (as you have acknowledged even from the word it self) is a cutting in two, renting and dividing into parts, that which was one before, &c. whensoever therefore this is not done, there cannot possibly be any Schisme. Now who sees not, that when persons are excommunicated, whether justly or unjustly, so long as they remain in the acknowledgement of the Pastours Authority quietly and peaceably, that the Unity remains still? there being no diversity of parts raised up by them.

If you object, that it is not possible to conceive, how a part should be cut off from the Church (as it is by Excommunication)



cation) and yet no division made of that part from the whole, we answer, first, That all Division from the Church is not sufficient for Schisme; for then in just Excommunication, where, as true, a Division from the Church is made (nay much truer then in unjust Excommunication) Schisme should be committed. For as is above delivered, Schisme must be a sinfull, causeless, precipitous (and in that sense voluntary) separation, or division from the Church. Secondly, we answer, That Excommunication makes a division onely from the actuall Communion with the Church, but makes not that part excommunicated to be independant of the Church, and so wholly disunited from the oeconomy and government of the Church; and consequently makes no division in the Unity of the Church: for persons excommunicated (by force of sole Excommunication) neither are exempted, nor exempt themselves, from the Spirituall power of the Church, but remain in one Politique body with the Church, as they did before; though for a time disobedient to those, whose power over them they acknowledge. As a person who is outlawed in a Commonwealth, though he  
 (nois.) be

be morally excommunicated and deprived of the Priviledges and Benefits of the Law, and other advantages of the Commonwealth, yet he remains still, and acknowledges himself to remain a true Subject of that Commonwealth, and makes one Politique Body with it. Or as a part of the Body withered and dried up, remains still in some sort united to the Body, and dependent of it, though it be deprived of the communion of those vitall spirits and comforts, which the living and usefull parts have. We answer, thirdly, That though it should be granted, that excommunicated persons are divided from the Church in some sense, yet that division is not sufficient for Schisme: for there may be a double Division from the Church, the one meerly privative or Negative, the other Positive. The Privative, or Negative Division is, when the part divided is for the time of its division no more of the Church, but yet is not against the Church by any Positive opposition. The Positive Division is, when the part divided opposes the Church, sides against the Church, condemns and despises the Church, and its Governours, and stands in open defiance of the Church. Now this

second Division onely, by the Universall consent of the holy Fathers and Tradition, was alwayes esteemed Schisme; and no lesse then this was ever esteemed Schisme amongst them, as we have already proved. Whence follows, (supposing what we have said before) that he, who excommunicates others unjustly, is neither a Schismaticque himself, nor a true cause of Schisme; because he neither makes himself, nor causes others to make, such a Positive Division, as this now described is, from the Church; without which, never was, nor ever can be Schisme.

P. 13.

We confesse, for all your words you might yet say, if you will, that though you make *hatred and contempt* of Catholique Communion to be the proper *negation* of formall Schisme, yet that you mean, that *hatred* must have *contempt* joyned with it; or else that it is not according to you sufficient. This, if you say, the Controversie is not ended, we confesse; but yet in all reason near an end, to them that observe the difference 'twixt assertions, of which some reason may be imagined, and those of which  
none

none can be. For tell us, we pray, why hatred of Catholique Communion, or envy of Catholique Communion, or emulation of Catholique Communion, or any want of the truth or love of Catholique Communion, in those that call themselves Christians, should not as truly render the unjust Excommunicatour formally schismaticall, as well as the contempt of Catholique Communion. We would fain know, what hath contempt more of ingredience into Schisme, then hatred, yea, then envy, or want of love. Surely one, the commonest source of Schisme being pride and ambition, in setting up another Communion in opposition to the Catholique Communion, is not onely as much, but rather *Emulation* then *Contempt* of Catholique Communion.

## C. 14.

*We stand neither upon the internall acts of Hatred, Contempt, Emulation, want of Love, &c. (as we now told you) in the constitution of our formall reason of Schisme: we neither have, nor do acknowledge any other, then what we delivered in our Definition, viz. A voluntary separation of*

ones self from the whole true visible Church of Christ; let that separation proceed from what of those roots it will, and let which of those, you please, be the originall root, remote or immediate disposition to it, as sometimes one may be, and sometimes another, now more and then fewer of them, according to different circumstances and affections of persons: for that, as you confesse, touches not the formall reason, but the cause, or motive, to fall into Schisme: we treat of a full and compleat Schisme, containing both the internall and the externall acts of it; this we say, is a voluntary separation of ones self from the whole Church, and nothing else.

P. 14.

But indeed the want of the truth of love of it, is the one root of all those vicious Affections, whether Hatred, Envy, Emulation, or Contempt of it, as the Love is the summe of all the opposite Vertues.

C. 15.

*If the want of the truth of the love of Catholique Communion (as you understand Communion) be the one root of those vicious affections, which (at least some of them*

as

as you said just now of Emulation, may be, and are often the causes of Schisme, or dispositions to it; how came you to say above, that the want of the truth of the love of Catholique Communion, is alwayes the causa proxima of Schisme? Nay, how fall you upon this other contrariety yet a little before, that the want of the truth of the love of Catholique Communion may proceed from the Contempt, or Hatred, or Envy of it, &c. when you say, speaking of that want, whether it be from contempt of it, or from hatred of it, or from envy of it? &c. Thus you make the tree to proceed from the root, and the root from the tree; thus you make that Love both to be alwayes a causa proxima of Schisme, and yet sometimes to be no causa proxima, but remota; and thus you say what you please, to serve your present occasion, without any reflexion on what you said before.

P. 15.

Why also were the Fathers here forgot? when they describe Schisme and Schismaticus, is it by Contempt onely, or onely by Hatred? Is it not by want of love? *Schismaticus, qui non diligit.... Schismaticus, quia non diligit proximum....*

*Schisma contra Charitatem, ac Hæresis contra Fidem.....* Indeed the whole Controversie being again cleared, if this be clear, we will produce the words of the Fathers themselves.

## C. 16.

*Which of us ever denied, or so much as questioned, that Schisme is contra charitatem, &c. against Charity, &c. The present Question is, Whether every unjust Excommunication of others, which proceeds out of the want of the truth of the love of Catholique Communion, that is, of actual Communion onely, with the rest of Christians, (for that alone is taken away by Excommunication) be mortally schismaticall: now let us see, whether the Texts of the Fathers here cited by you prove this.*

## P. 16.

*St. Augustin. lib. 2. contra Donatist. Nobis ostendit Dominus Deus noster per pacificum Episcopum Cyprianum, & illos qui consenserunt, quantum sit Catholica Unitas diligenda, ut in eo quod aliter sapiebant, donec id quoque Deus revelaret, tolerarent potius diversa sentientes, quam se ab eis nefario Schismate separarent.* Where St. Augustine makes the Not-love of



of Catholique Unity, or Communion, the root of nefarious Schism.

C. 17.

St. Augustine there speaks of the love of Catholique Unity onely, (*Catholica unitas diligenda*) not of actuall Catholique Communion, as you onely do; which we have now proved to be different; and puts the formall reason of mortall Schisme the very same with ours, *quàm se ab eis nefario Schismate separarent*, rather then to dividethemselves from them (that is, from those of the Catholique Unity, who held the contrary opinion to St. Cyprian) by a wicked Schisme. Thus you not onely prove not your formall reason by this Text against us; but prove our formall reason against your selves. It seems you were in very great want of proofs; when you take up such as these.

P. 17.

St. Augustine, lib. De Fide & Symbolo, cap. 8. *Quapropter nec Hereticus pertinet ad Ecclesiam Catholicam, quia non diligit Deum; nec Schismaticus, quia non diligit proximum.*

C. 18.

This Text must either suppose, that

there is no want of love of our Neighbour, beside the want of truth of the love of Catholique Communion, (which supposition is manifestly false) or it touches not the least, that which you pretend to prove from it.

## P. 18.

St. Augustine lib. 7. contra Donatist. cap. 26. *Et hic confitetur (Geminiannus) apertissime quosdam de Collegiis suis diversa sensisse: unde etiam atque etiam confirmatur amor unitatis, quod ab invicem nullo schismate separati sunt, donec alteri eorum, si quid aliter saperent, Deus revelaret.* As above St. Augustine made the Not-love of Catholique Unity, the root of criminal Schisme; so here the love of Catholique Unity the cause, that no Schisme was found in such.

## C. 19.

*It was not, as it seems, sufficient for you, to have once, not onely not proved your Tenet, by mistaking Unity for Communion; and to have proved ours, by shewing Schisme to consist in the separation of Christians one from another, in the citation of your Texts; but to be sure that both these should be really done, you do them here the second time,*

time, as appears by the words of this Text,  
Amor unitatis..... Nullo Schismate se-  
parati.

P. 19.

*Gregorius Magnus, Exposit. Moral.* 18.  
in *Job*, cap. 28. cap. 24. Alii quippe prava  
de Deo sentiunt, alii recta Deo auctore  
tenent, sed unitatem cum fratribus non  
tenent: Illi errore fidei, isti verò Schi-  
smatis perpetratione divisi sunt. Unde  
& in ipsâ primâ parte Decalogi utra-  
rumque partium culpæ reperiuntur, cum  
divinâ voce dicitur, Diliges Dominum  
Deum tuum ex toto corde tuo, & ex totâ  
animâ tuâ, & ex totâ virtute tuâ: atque  
mox subditur, Diliges proximum tuum,  
sicut teipsum. Qui enim de Deo perversa  
sentit, liquet projecto, quia Deum non  
diligit. Qui verò de Deo recta sentiens,  
à sanctæ Ecclesiæ unitate divisus est,  
constat, quia proximum non diligit;  
quem habere socium recusat. Quisquis  
ergo ab hâc unitate matris Ecclesiæ, sive  
per Hæresim de Deo perversa sentiendo;  
sive errore Schismaticis proximum non  
diligendo dividitur; charitatis hujus gra-  
tia privatur.

C. 20.

MS

And:

And that you may be cock-sure not to misse these your mistakes, to the two former you add a third non-probation of your own probandum, and probation of our formal reason: a sanctæ Ecclesiæ unitate, from the Unity of the holy Church, there's yours first: divisus est, is divided; there's your second. Are not these three sound proofs from the holy Fathers?

P. 20.

But by *non diligit proximum* in these testimonies, we know must be understood the not-love of our Neighbour, with that speciall Evangelicall love, which Christ hath commanded to be among all his Disciples, amongst all the members of his Body, as they are under him the Head, joyned together in one Body, and in one Communion Ecclesiasticall of one Body; and so *non diligit Schismaticos* is properly that which we say, That want of the truth of the love of Catholique Communion must be, were ever there is any Schisme, or *formalis ratio* of any the least Schisme at all.

C. 21.

We absolutely deny (as we have alwayes denied) that these Texts can be understood of

of the want of the truth of the love of Catholique actuall Communion, which onely is taken away by unjust Excommunication; for they clearly speak of the love of Catholique Unity; which, as it is the root of Catholique Actuall Communion, so can that Unity remaine without that actuall Communion, as we have shewed: that being (as these holy Fathers here say) formally destroyed onely by Division and Separation of ones self from and against the Church; not by Excommunication, whether just or unjust, from the actuall Communion with it. For to be Schisme, the Unity of the Church must be rent in pieces, and those parts, which before Schisme were in the Unity of the Body, or adhering to it, and no way opposing themselves against it by Schisme, become rent off from it, and maintain that rent which they have made, positively and seditiously, as separate parts, against it. When therefore an unjust Excommunicator pretends to cut others off from the Communion of the Church, that is, to make those no parts of the Church, which before were parts, (which is the utmost that any affirm; can be effected by Excommunication) he commits neither Schisme himself,

himself, nor is the cause of Schisme in others; because he neither seditiously acts as a part separate from, and against the Church, neither intends he, or effects, that others should do so. Now that he, who unjustly and sinfully pretends to make one no part of the Church in this sole Negative manner, may be neither a Schismaticque, nor a cause of Schisme, is evident; for he, who fraudently perswades another to become an Infidel, or Ethnique, (though he who perswades be a Christian) and wholly to renounce Christ and his Religion, makes that person, who before was a part of the Church, to become no part of it, and yet he is neither Schismaticque, nor a cause of Schisme: And he who wilfully kills another, intending to have him dye in state of Mortall sin, does what in him lies, to make him, who was a part of the Church, to become no part of it; and yet he is neither Schismaticque, nor cause of Schisme: that then he become either the one or the other, he must either act himself as a part, and body separate from the Church, against the Church; or he must intend to make others to do so. The unjust Excommunicatour therefore makes onely a non-union, or cessation.

tion of an Union of some part to the Church, which is not Schism, but makes no disunion, or dissention of that part from and against the Church, which onely is Schisme. And here we have directly and amply answered your Objection, made unto us, ut supra, Pag. 199. That a Pope, or Patriarch, unjustly excommunicating others, is no Schismaticque, because he makes onely a Privative non-union or cessatton of being a part of the Church in her actuall Communion, but no Positive disunion, or dissenting separation from and against the Church, which is onely termed a Rent, or Schisme, amongst Christians by the holy Fathers.

P. 21.

This, which you perhaps, instead of confuting, will call a long digression, is so materiall, that besides what we have said, that upon your answering one or two questions, it brings the whole Controversie visibly to an immediate issue, nearer at least then ever yet it came to betwixt us: also the observation, that the want of the love of Catholique Communion being as certainly the reviction of formall mortall Schisme in the divider, (which you must deny) as the contempt  
of



of Catholique Communion, (which you assert) will so much shorten all the following discourse; that it self almost alone answers whatsoever Arguments you frame directly against our formall reason of Schisme in all your following Papers, that you have brought in; and dissolves your Answers to our Arguments for the most part.

## C. 22.

*Whether these long discourses were digressions, or no, we leave to the Readers; as also how near you have brought the controversie to an end, and answered the most part of our Arguments by them.*

## P. 22.

Secondly, since when we had at your desire assigned you our *formall reason* of Schisme, three severall wayes for more perspicuity expressed, you without ever explicately laying down yours, betake you presently to impugne ours, onely in two words you let fall, as insinuating something you would require to the formall reason of Schisme, *viz. Contempt of Catholique Communion, and sometime Hatred and Contempt of Catholique Communion*: and these two words dispersedly

ly in numberlesse places repeated : therefore we thought best once for all together, to speak to them.

C. 23.

*You have carped at us above, for having a first without a second, and here give us leave to minde you, that you have a second, nay and a third too, without a first. To that of Contempt, Hatred, &c. we have answered already.*

P. 23.

Thirdly, the Paragraph of yours to which we answer in all, this being that, where you oppose against us the common apprehension, which all understanding Christians have, and ever have had, of this horrid sin of Schisme, that every one, who is guilty of it, cannot, nor ever was endured to be called a member of the Catholique Church, and consequently was out of the state of salvation : as if, because we said, St. Paul taxeth the Corinthians with Schismes, and calls them *Carnall* for them, and yet in the same Chapter and Verse, he acknowledges them Babes in Christ, therefore you would perswade your Auditors, that you were more zealous opposers of Schisme in this Controversie

troverſie then we ; and that *St. Paul* ſpake improperly , calling that *Schiſme*, which properly was not ſo.

C. 24.

*You have an excellent art in ſkipping over difficulties , when you cannot ſolve them. Here you put our Objection home enough : But what ſay you to it ? Is the thing we ſay (and you acknowledge we ſay ſo) true or no ? Did we here oppoſe againſt you, ſay you, the common apprehenſion, which all underſtanding Chriſtians have ever had of this horrid ſin of Schiſme ? that every one , who is guilty of it, cannot, nor ever was endured to be called a member of the Catholique Church, &c. This is very true ; we object this againſt you. But what ſay you to it ? Is the thing objected true or no ? not a word of that. Had all underſtanding Chriſtians alwayes ſuch a perſwaſion, or no ? not a word to this. If they had, ſay we , then you go againſt the perſwaſion of all underſtanding Chriſtians : if they had not, why have you not denied it ? But it ſeems you are wiſe enough to be ſilent, where nothing can be ſaid. But do not you manifeſtly ſay the contrary to all underſtanding Chriſtians ? Not a word to this neither.*

neither. You cannot deny it, because you have already delivered it often in your Papers; and yet you will not acknowledge it, lest you should be convinced (by your own clear confession) to hold contrary to all understanding Christians.

What then was to be done? to say nothing, but make a silent glibbe transition to another question. Call you this disputing. You glide over to St. Paul. The Question is not now, whether St. Paul spoke of proper Schisme or no; but whether all understanding Christians speak properly, when they say, That no schismatiques can be true member of the Catholique Church: answer you to this, and make not an Objection of your own, instead of answering to ours. This we objected as a Truth universally known and embraced; nay, and confirmed it by a clear Text of St. Augustine; and you afford not a word of answer, neither to the one nor the other. But let us hear your Objection: Though St. Paul, say you, taxes the Corinthians with Schismes, yet he calls them, Babes in Christ. What then? He speaks of Schismes in a large sense, and not of proper and strict Schisme. This is our answer. Oh,  
but

but then, say you, we blame St. Paul for speaking improperly. Why so? because he speaks of a Schisme, which is not a strict and proper Schisme, speaks he therefore improperly? When St. John, Chap. 9. said, Et erat Schisma inter illos, and there was a Schisme amongst them; did he speak of a strict and proper Schisme or no? If he did, then all proper Schisme is not contained under your Definition: nay, you your self must confesse, that what St. Paul here calls Schismes, are not strict and proper Schismes, unlesse you grant, that the want of fellow-feeling of each others sufferings, be proper Schismes; for that, being onely a disagreement of Opinions, is not proper Schisme. If he spake not of proper Schisme, then, according to you, he spake improperly: solve this, and your Objection is solved. Know you not, that one is then onely said to speak improperly, when he uses not proper words to expresse his meaning: and who, we pray you, sayes, that Saint Paul did this?

P. 24.

whereas be it but observed in this our last discourse, that besides that, you excuse from Schisme those that so rent and  
tear

tear Christs Body the Church, that they unjustly cut off whole Churches, and in in them thousands of live-members of Christs mysticall Body, and yet no Schismatiques also.

C. 25.

'Tis most true; such as you untruly call Rents in the Church, made by vertue of sole unjust Excommunication, we say, that the Causers of them are no Schismatiques: and yet we say withall, (which you declare not) that they are damnable sinners, by way of Tyranny, Usurpation, Oppression, Cruelty, &c. and so wholly incapable of salvation, so long as they continue knowingly that Excommunication. We agree therefore both of us in this, that they are damnable sinners; but we say, that they are not Schismatiques; and the damnable sin which they commit, is not Schisme, but Tyranny, &c. And you say, they are Schismatiques, and their sin in this, Schisme. Now by declaring that we held them not to be Schismatiques, and not declaring, that we held them damnable sinners, as much as you, you might have exposed your Reader here to think, that we wholly excused such from damnable sin, and put them in the state of salvation.

*P. 25.*

The whole of your zeal against Schism amounts but to this; that no other can be damnable sin in your opinion, but onely that, wherein is included contempt of Catholique Communion: and therefore nothing else shall be Schisme. Whereas we avow, that not onely Contempt of Catholique Communion, but all want of the truth of Love of Catholique Communion, renders the Divider, whether of himself, or other, from the Church-communion, alwayes mortally, criminally schismaticall, and in the state of death spirituall, and guilt of damnation: and so we not less, but more then you, discover the damnation due to Schisme and Schismatiques, even all in whom is wanting but the truth of that love, whereby the Fathers describe Schisme.

*C. 26.*

*Here you pursue the former Error: the whole of our Zeal is to deliver the nature of Schisme, as the holy Fathers and other Classique Authors, as well yours as ours, have delivered it to us, and not to invent a new notion of it, which you have done. The sum therefore of this difficulty comes*  
to



to this, that the proper Notion of Schisme is a voluntary separation of ones self from the Church: whereby the party separating, remaining still in profession and perswasion a Christian, contends against the Church, and maintains himself and his party as a separate Body from it. This onely is a rent, a division, a rebellion, a sedition, and so onely a Schisme; and whatsoever is not this, (as no unjust Interdict, Suspension, or Excommunication of others is) is not, never was, nor ever can be truly stiled Schisme.

---

**SECT.**

## SECT. 2.

*The Texts of Scriptures against the Catholiques Definition answered.*

C. 27.

**T**O your Proofs out of Scripture, to confirm this your formall reason, *ut supra*, Pag. 196, 197, 198. we now answer; To that of 1 Cor. 12.25. That the Apostle there speaks of *Schisme*, *largo modo sumpto*, taken in a large sense as it comprehends all strifes, contentions, and disagreements amongst Christians; as it is taken, *Joan. 9. 16. Καὶ σχίσμα ἦν ἐν αὐτοῖς*, *Et Schisma erat inter illos*; which the Protestant Bible translates, *And there was a Division amongst them*; and *Beza*, *Et erat dissidium inter eos*, that is, as appears by the Text, there was a difference of opinions, concerning our Saviour amongst them; which passing lightly as a contention betwixt them, could not be the great sin of *Schisme*, whereof we speak. Such a *Schisme* as this was that cited by you, 1 Cor. 12.25. For it is said, *Ne sit schisma*  
in

in corpore, not *à corpore*; that there may be no Schisme in the body, not from the body. Now the Schisme which is in the Body of the Church, cannot be the great sin of Schisme, whereof we treat, as we have \* proved above from the holy Fathers: Therefore it must be Schisme largely taken, for some lesse dissention, or disagreement; which destroyes not the Unity of the Church; and therefore *Bera* there translates *diffidium*, disagreement; and not *Schisma*, Schisme; and so seems to be rather a defect against the perfection of that Charity, which every one should, according to true perfection endeavour to attain, then against the entire essence of it; which appears, because the Apostle addes, that what he requires to avoid this Schisme in the body, is, that one member should have a diligent care for the rest; and every one should have a fellow-feeling of each others good or harm; that they should all, and each of them, grieve and rejoyce with each other. As therefore the want of this mutual care and fellow-feeling each of other, is not formally Schisme, whereof we treat, so the saying of the head to the foot, I have

*have no need of thee* (which you press) will be no formal Schisme in our sense, but a disposition to some disagreement and strife amongst the parts; which therefore are to be avoided, lest that disagreement should follow. *Ne fiat Schisma in corpore.*

Your second proof. Rom. 16. 16, 17. Speaks manifestly of Heresie, or Error in Faith. For it sayes, *παρὰ τὴν διδασχὴν ἣν ὑμεῖς ἐλάβετε*, which your English Bible ha's, *contrary to the doctrine which you have learned*; which properly sounds Heresies, especially when St. Paul sayes, verse 17. That the Authors of such divisions and scandals *by fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple*. And though you may happily say, that these words do not necessarily signifie Heresies, but may signifie a Schism introduced by deceivers into the Church, yet that will not help your cause: for though it could be proved, that they may signifie that, yet that hinders not, but they may also signifie the other; and to draw an effectual argument from these words for you, you must not onely prove that they may, but that they ought to signifie that for which you alledge them.

Hence

Hence appears, that your Argument drawn from the sense, which you put upon the Text, of any kinde of *διχοστασία*, is grounded in a false supposition; and so Null.

In *Luc.* 12. 41. 46. And *Matth.* 24. 43. There is no mention at all of Schism, or sedition; but onely of oppression and injury done by that steward to his fellow-servants: and if that should happen, which you conjecture, that he should beat some of them out of doors, so long as he is ready to receive them again, when his master, or the publique magistrate commands him (upon the servants complaint, or otherwise) there is an injury, and a sejunction, but no sedition, nor compleat separation made; which notwithstanding must be found in Schisme. And hence we answer to your chief fundamental Argument, considered absolutely in it self, and pressed by you, *pag.* 24. That when a Pope, Patriarch, or Metropolitan, &c. excommunicates unjustly a Province, or City, whereof they are lawful Superiours, so long as neither the excommunicatour, nor the excommunicated contemn, or reject the authority

N

of

of their Superiours, and make themselves a rebellious party against them, there is no schismatical separation committed by that excommunication: which must consist in that spiritual rebellious siding and opposing the Church, or all their lawfull Ecclesiastical Superiours. This we have already proved by the example of those who unjustly deposed St. *Chrysostome* (seeing you account Schisme to be committed as well by unjust suspension, interdict, deposition, &c. as being violations of the benefit of the bond of external Communion, as by unjust excommunication) who, notwithstanding that, were not Schismatiques. Secondly, we prove it from the expresse authority of St. *Augustin*. lib. *de verâ religione*. cap. 6. *Sæpe finit Divina Providentia, per non nullus nimium turbulentas carnalium hominum seditiones expelli de congregatione Christianâ etiam bonos viros quam contumeliam, vel injuriam suam, cum patientissimè pro Ecclesiæ pace, tolerant, neque ulla novitates vel Schismatis, vel Hæresis moliti fuerint docebunt homines, quam vero affectu, & quantâ sinceritate charitatis Deo serviendum sit. Talium ergo vi-*  
*rorum*

rorum propositum est, vel sedatis remeare turbinibus; aut si id non sinantur, vel eadem tempestate perseverante, vel ne suo reditu talis aut scavior oriatur, tenent voluntatem consulendi, etiam iis ipsis, quorum motibus turbationibusq; cesserunt, sine ulla Conventiculorum segregatione; usque ad mortem defendentes, & testimonio juvantes eam fidem, quam in Ecclesiâ Catholicâ prædicari sciunt. It often happens, saith St. Augustine, That the Divine Providence permits, by certain too much turbulent seditions of carnal men, that even good men are expelled out of the Christian congregation: which contumely, or injury done to them, when they suffered it most patiently for the peace of the Church, and went not about to set up any novelties of *Schismes* or *Heresies*, they will teach men with how true an affection, and with how much sincerity God is to be served. It is therefore the resolution of such men, either to return again, the troubles passed over, or if that be not permitted, or the same tempest still continuing, or at least by their return, the like or more cruel should arise, they are resolved to give counsel, or provide



vide help to those, to whose motions and troubles they yielded, without any segregation of Conventicles; defending even till death, and by their testimony assisting that faith, which they know to be preached in the Catholique Church. Where to incurre Schisme, he judges it necessary on the part of those who are unjustly excommunicated, to make Conventicles and parties against the Church, and places Schism in this. And on the part of those, who were the violent ejectours, (it cannot be gathered from these words, of what condition, state, or authority they were) he places no schism at all; but supposes, that those who were unjustly ejected, lived in the same unity of Christian charity towards them, as they did before, by advising them, and no way separating themselves from them.

This admirable example of true Christian charity, patience, and humility, this holy Doctour here propounds to be followed by all Gods servants: and certainly, (supposing that Protestants had been unjustly ejected out of the Church, as they pretend, and we deny) had they behaved

behaved themselves, as these good men did, *without any segregation of Conventicles*, suffering most patiently this contumely and injury, all the world would have deservedly esteemed them *good men*. But how quite contrary to this example they have proceeded, both in their first beginnings and ever since, we leave to what the whole Christian world knows to have passed in their proceedings, in these two last ages.

## S E C T. 3.

*The Definition of the Catholique Disputants defended.*

## C. 28.

**F**Ourthly, hence follows a plain contradiction to what you said, that *our definition was not admitted by you as a true convertible definition*; which now you must admit to be true and convertible. For if every separation of ones self, &c. be Schisme, as you have already granted, when you admitted that our definition was a true proposition: and that on the other side, every Schisme be a separation of ones self from the whole Church, as it cannot but be, if an active separation of others ~~never~~ be schismatical, but when the reason adjoyned to it, includes essentially a separation of ones self from the whole visible Church, our definition must needs be a convertible definition. And as necessarily is it a true definition; for it is not convertible in a propriety, or accidentall predicate to  
Schism,

Schism, but in a primary, essentiall, and most formall reason of Schisme. For if separation of ones self be not such a predicate, as this in relation to Schisme, I would gladly know, what other single notion can there be nominated, wherein the essence of Schisme consists: and from which, this of separation, &c. flows as appropriety from an essential formality. I beseech you satisfie this difficulty.

P. 28.

Here you proceed to attempt the verifying of your explication of the definition, and of your assertion. A. 6. That no active separation, save that of ones self from the whole Church, can properly be termed Schisme; which also you express in other words in the same place. A. 6. He who separates another actively by excommunication from the Church, &c. cannot himself be a Schismaticque. All this you think is maintained without difficulty, if you be understood, as Logicians and Philosophers, and as speaking to such in *sensu formali*, and *quatenus talis*, standing in the sole formality and intrinsicall notion, &c. Where we will joyn issue with you, and enquire if this hath

272 *The Catholiques definition defended.*

scued, or can at all rescue your explication of your definition, and so your definition (as you would have us understand it) from a gross error in the very principle.

To your assertion. *A. 6.* We did and do oppose, that if some voluntary separation of others by unjust excommunication, for some unjust cause, be Schisme, then it is not true, which you lay down as a principle (in the explication of your definition, That none who separates another actively by excommunication from the Church, &c. can himself be a Schismaticque, that is, (that we may take your directions to understand you, as you would be understood, *quatenus talis*, in *sensu formali*) he cannot be a Schismaticque *in*, and *by*, and *for* his so doing prescind from all other external accidental adjuncts, and meerly for his unjust excommunication of others inflicted for some unjust cause; for so are your words here, *Such is not Schisme in a formal sense, or quatenus tale, as such an active unjust separation of others. And again, our proposition (say you) is most true. For no unjust active separation of others from the Church,*

Church, standing in the sole formality, or intrinsecall notion of such an active separation, can properly be termed Schisme. Now at length, surely, you are understood by us, as you would be understood. Against this you could not but know, remember and consider, when you wrote this last explication of your selves, that we had all along offered to you this discourse, to revince the untruth of your former explication, That some voluntary active unjust separation of others, some unjust separation or ejecting, said we, that's inflicted for some unjust cause, particularly when inflicted on the Brethren confessedly, lively members of Christ, onely for their keeping due Catholique Communion (which is one unjust cause surely, that renders any Excommunication, or Ejection inflicted for that sole cause, *quatenus tale*, properly and formally an unjust Excommunication) then and so often at least such active unjust separation of others, and now we adde *quatenus tale*, as such an active unjust Separation of others, (which are your words) is properly Schisme.

We hope this our Affirmation is fully

274 *The Catholiques definition defended.*

fully *ad oppositum*, and that it is no Sophisme (*ὁ σοφισμὸς*) to inferre, that if this be true, then your assertion, and your own explication of your Definition is overthrown, and consequently your Definition is null and void. But now we subsume; this our Affirmation is most true: Therefore your assertion, and explication of your Definition, and your Definition it self are not so. The *Minor* we thus shew to be true. That active Separation of others, which is therefore rendered Schismaticall, because inflicted for no other, save onely some unjust cause *in materiâ juris* objected to them, is therefore rendered Schismaticall, because it is such an active unjust Separation of others, or *quatenus tale*: But some active Separation of others is therefore rendered Schismaticall, because inflicted for no other, save onely some unjust cause *in materiâ juris* objected to them: *Ergo*, some active separation of others is therefore rendered Schismaticall, *because it is such an active separation of others, or quatenus tale.*

The *Major* of this Syllogisme we thus made good. If in any active Separation



tion whatsoever of others, being inflicted for no other save onely some unjust cause, &c. can and doth render such active Separation of others, *quatenus tale*, as inflicted for no other, but for some unjust cause, essentially, necessarily, and formally an active unjust Separation of others, then that active separation of others, which is *therefore* rendered Schismaticall, because inflicted for no other, save onely some unjust cause, &c. is also *therefore* rendered Schismaticall, because it is such an active unjust Separation of others, or *quatenus tale*. But in any active Separation whatsoever of others, the being inflicted for no other, save onely some unjust cause, &c. can and doth render such active Separation of others, *quatenus tale*, (as done for no other), but for some unjust cause, &c) essentially, necessarily, and formally an active unjust Separation of others.

*Ergo.*

The *Minor*, or second proposition of our second Syllogisme, viz. Some active Separation of others is therefore rendered Schismaticall because inflicted for no other, save onely some unjust cause in

*materia*

276 *The Catholiques definition defended.*

*materiâ juris* objected to them, we thus prove.

That active Separation of others, which is therefore rendered Schismaticall, because inflicted for no other cause *in materiâ juris* objected to them, save onely for their keeping due Catholique Communion, is therefore rendered Schismaticall, because inflicted for no other, save onely some unjust cause, &c. *in materiâ juris* objected to them. But some active Separation of others is therefore rendered Schismaticall, because inflicted for no other cause *in materiâ juris* objected to them, save onely for their keeping due Catholique Communion. *Ergo*, some active Separation of others is therefore rendered Schismaticall, because inflicted for no other, save onely some unjust cause *in materia juris* objected to them. *Quod erat demonstrandum.*

The *Major* of this Syllogisme is manifestly true, if this be but so (which is most manifest) that to inflict on others Separation from the Church for no other cause, save onely for their keeping due Catholique Communion, is to inflict it for no other cause, save some unjust one,

*The Catholiques definition defended.* 277

one, which is as true, as that that cause objected is, most certainly an unjust one.

The *Minor* of this fourth Syllogisme, which is all that can remain to be proved, viz. That some active Separation of others is *therefore* rendered Schismaticall, because inflicted for no other cause in *materia juris* objected to them, save onely for the keeping due Catholique Communion.

This judge you, if we shew it not now at last your own confession, which (though you may disdain to have it said, yet the impartiall Auditours may discern to have been extorted from you by our Arguments.

(Argument 3. against our Proposition) your Confession, I say, speaks this. In our present case, when one, (that is, any one, by your own rule) is ejected unjustly out of the Church for this onely reason, because he keeps due Catholique Communion, that reason operating, &c. renders the ejection Schismaticall.

Thus you see, as to our refuting of your Assertion, and your Explication of your Definition, and so of your Definition,

278 *The Catholiques definition defended.*

on, as it is yours and allowed us to understand, and also as to our whole Controversie hitherto at all moved, we need not defend against you any more, then that some unjust active Separation of others, *as such unjust active Separation of others*, is truly and properly Schismaticall That *some injustice* at least in the active Separation of others, (and adde, if you will also, in the *Interdict* and *Suspension* of others) may render it Schismaticall; whether all injustice do so in some degree or other, when properly, formally, and manifestly it is injustice, (though we owe it not to you by any justice as yet, whilest we are controverting about the Explication) out of our love to charity, and just hatred of all sorts of Schisme, which our Definition includes more then yours, and out of a true desire to bring the controversie on all parts to a speedy and clear issue, (as shall be possible to us) we shall presently acquaint you clearly with our full sense therein, and about the *formalis ratio*, wherein all Schismes agree. Hence then having good reason to suppose your definition already disproved, and that we have already

ready.

ready done what ever is needfull to do, though we should adde no more, &c.

And now (to use your own words in this paper) give us leave to take notice of this passage of yours extorted from you by the force of truth, and compare it with your defence and explication of your Definition. He who separates another actively by Excommunication from the Church, &c. cannot himself be a Schismaticque. Where your Proposition, He who separates, &c. If it be an universall Proposition, as it must be, if you will prove any thing, or speak Logically (as you have given the law to us in your Argument next before this, and we submitted to it) must say thus much, No one, who separates another actively by Excommunication from the Church, can himself be a Schismaticque: which surely is contradictions to your other Proposition, which you lay down here in these words, Some active unjust Excommunicating of others is rendred Schismaticall, and therefore surely is Schismaticall, or else it is not what it is rendred, when it is so rendred; and then indeed we might be deceived: for a man might render himself

guilty

280 The Catholiques definition defended.

guilty of Schisme, and yet not be guilty of  
it on other bloudy w<sup>th</sup> arguon<sup>t</sup>

Next you deliver, that an unjust Ex-  
communication, when it is Schismaticall,  
hath alwayes some accidental externall  
reason adjoynd to the unjust Excommu-  
nication, which renders it schismaticall:  
And then you say also in our present case,  
if when one, that is any one, is ejected un-  
justly out of the Church, for this onely rea-  
son, because he keeps due Catholique  
Communion, that reason operating, &c.  
renders the ejection schismaticall. Now  
how the unjust cause, or reason, which you  
here suppose to be the motive, and which  
being the motive, and unjust, doth necessa-  
rily and essentially render that act of such  
ejecting others out of the Church an unjust  
ejection, can yet be said to be onely an ad-  
joynd accidental reason of such unjust  
ejection, or excommunication, which ren-  
ders it schismaticall, we profess not to un-  
derstand. That which is but accidentally  
adjoynd may be removed, and the thing  
left what it was. Now if you remove  
that, which you here suppose the reason of  
the injustice of the Excommunication,  
(which you here recite to be that unjust  
cause

cause onely, because they keep due Catholique Communion) you remove away the reason of the schismaticalnesse of the Excommunication; or else you can, (which we adventure to say, you will never be able to do) assigne some other reason of the schismaticalnesse of such Excommunication, which you acknowledge rendred such, because done for that onely reason, or unjust cause, separated from all injustice of the Excommunication: which if you think you can, we pray you, name it; and we will undertake to prove it, either no reason of the Schismaticalnesse, or a reason of the injustice of Excommunication, and that injustice to have caused the Schismaticalnesse: And all this, before you go about it, we thus evince by this following Discourse, to be a vain undertaking.

Some thing that was the unjust cause, or motive (in your now supposed case) rendred the Ejection schismaticall. But whatsoever was the unjust cause, or motive (in your now supposed case) rendred the Excommunication unjust. Therefore something that rendred the Excommunication unjust (in your now supposed case) rendred it schismaticall.

*And*



282 *The Catholiques definition defended.*

And consequently it follows, that that which rendred the Excommunication unjust (and so was essentiall to that unjust Excommunication, as it was so an unjust one) was not an externall accidentall adjunct to the unjust Excommunication, as we have proved; and therefore neither to the Schismaticalness of that Excommunication, for our former already proved Conclusion; because we say, we have proved, that something which rendred the Excommunication unjust, rendred it Schismaticall: Therefore some Schismaticalness at least (h. e. some guilt of Schisme is produced by an unjust Excommunication, as such, and so not onely this your Proposition of an externall accidentall influence of something beside the injustice upon the Schismaticalness of the Excommunication is overthrown: but also your Definition it self; wherein you profess, in your defense and explanation of it here and elsewhere, that no unjust Excommunication, or separating of others, as such, without some adjunct externall, or accidentall to the unjust Excommunication, can properly be termed Schisme; nor was intended in your Definition. And this we desire you to attend and speak to, as the main  
matter

matter of Controversie hitherto betwixt us, and not a diversion external to the Cause; as was almost one half of this your last paper; all introduced with this Preface; And here you will give us leave to take notice of another passage of yours, which passage was a passage indeed altogether externall to our principal question in hand; and accordingly in all your following Discourse, (which is well nigh half of the whole) you pursue the overthrowing that passage of ours, by nine Arguments; which yet you will never be able to confute.

To proceed, whereas next you say, in an unjust Excommunication, what ever is the reason, that renders it Schismaticall, it separates the Ejectour from the Church, not consequently, (as we said) but primarily, formally, and essentially; we having proved above, that the injustice of the Excommunication is that reason, we do now reply to you, that when it is said, the schismaticall unjust Excommunicatour separates himself from the whole Church, it must be meant, either that he voluntarily separates himself, or unvoluntarily. If it be said voluntarily (as should be said in your sense) then we deny, that such Schismaticall  
ticall

284 *The Catholiques definition defended.*

ticall unjust Excommunicatour doth at all necessarily separate himself from the whole Church: but if unvoluntarily (as we mean, when we say consequently) then we affirm, that he thus separating himself from the internall Communion of all the lively members of Christs Body, (which is enough for the affirming, that he separates himself in some true sense from the Church) doth it onely consequently; as the effect of a meritorious cause, (which is the way of his causing it) is in order of the nature of an effect consequent to such a cause. We have nothing further to consider in this Paragraph, but to observe and to minde you, how strangely, in the midst of your Metaphysicall disquisition of causes, formall, finall, accidentall, &c. you term that unjust motive of your supposed unjust Ejectour, (viz. That he doth it for this onely provocation, Because they keep due Catholique Communion) you term it we say, and that very strangely, a reason, operating in genere causæ finalis, (which if you think every impulsive cause to be, you are, we think, much mistaken. For that which is here acknowledged to operate as a provocation, which he would revenge, cannot be the finall cause;

*The Catholiques definition defended. 285*

cause; which is alwayes the thing we like, intend, and aim at: and though the revenge be by him intended, yet the provocation (whether just or unjust) is lookt upon by the unjust Ejectour, (and so operates upon him) as the meritorious Cause; which is, In genere Causæ Efficientis.

But because you have insisted rather upon your Explication, then your Definition, in the managing this pretended Contradiction against us, viz. That Separation is taken for Separation of ones self, we desire to know, whether ones self be words of your Definition, or no: if they be not, why put you them in your Argument, as a part thererof? If they be, then we suppose the former words one part are now become no part of your Definition; for one other is as well one part, as ones self. And then remember your own words, viz. Which you are obliged neither to destroy, nor alter in the progresse of your Discourse, unlesse you disallow of your own Definition.

To answer yet further to your altered Definition, we do still object, if you put ones self instead of one part, (as you have done  
in

in this Argument) that your Definition is still inconvertible; but not upon the same ground, upon which we first objected the inconvertibility. For before your Definitum was narrower, and impossible to be extended so far as your Definition, (which it ought to be) and now your Definition is narrower and impossible to be extended so far as your Definitum (which it ought to be.) For we prove, there is something Schisme, which is not a voluntary Separation of ones self. Neither is there any contradiction between this our Objection, and Firmilians Proposition, as you pretend; nor are we, upon the maintaining of that Proposition, bound to admit your Definition to be true and convertible, as you say. For though we admit, that every criminall Separation of another becomes consequentially the Separation of ones self; yet we do not say, that such a separation is a voluntary Separation of ones self. Therefore notwithstanding the Proposition taken out of Firmilian, be maintained by us, we object still inconvertibility to your altered Definition thus.

Though every voluntary separation of ones self be Schisme, yet every Schisme is not voluntary separation of ones self: And

our reason is, because some voluntary Separation of another is Schisme; and yet is not a voluntary Separation of ones self. And though Firmilian say, that Stephen the Bishop of Rome, while he thought to be able to cut off, or abstain so many Flocks and their Pastours, had cut off himself, and onely cut off himself, and addes, Ille vere Schismaticus est, &c. Yet the voluntariness, and purpose of the Act of Stephen was terminated to the separating and cutting off of others, and not to the cutting off of himself. 'Twas in his formal intention a voluntary cutting off of those others, but not in his formall intention a voluntary cutting off of himself. And hence it appears, that not any such cutting off ones self as that was, is a voluntary cutting off ones self: and this your selves maintain and contend for in some case of acknowledged unjust separating of others, while you say, one may separate another unjustly, and not onely have no will to separate himself, but an expresse will not to separate: and so the consequent separation (which we pretend) say you, would be onely passive and involuntary. Thus then the inconvertibility of your definition is not relieved by our maintaining

Firmi-

288 *The Catholiques definition defended.*

Firmilians words: For if this proposition every Schisme is a voluntary separating ones self) be false, as it is certainly false, if you speak as you professe to speak, in sensu formali, then your Definition is false in that which is essentiall to the truth of a Definition, viz. as to Convertibility: because though every voluntary separation of ones self from the whole true visible Church be Schisme, yet it is not true, that every Schisme is a voluntary separating ones self from the whole true visible Church of Christ. And because you say, you would gladly know from us, what other single notion there can be nominated, wherein the essence of Schisme consists, &c. and further beseech us to satisfie you in this difficulty, we would be sorry to fail you herein; and we make no difficulty again to affirme, that that, wherein the essence of Schisme consists, is this, The single notion of that uncharitablenesse, which is an injurious acting of the Will (elicit or imperate) to the violation of the Bond and Benefit of Ecclesiasticall externall Communion. If you now still rest unsatisfied, it is not our fault, who charitably follow you, whithersoever you call us.

To your fourth Argument, à Priori,  
we



*we say, That voluntary separating another and separating our selves, are not by us, if you do (as here you do) speak of them generally, and in Thesi, made the one consequentially to introduce the other. For some voluntary separating another is not separating our selves from the same Community, we never said, nor thought it was; yea, when the separation is just, we have, before you, plainly said the contrary. But if you consider unjust separation of others with separation of our selves, we say in this Hypothesis, and say constantly and truly, that separation of one self follows the injustice of the separation of another; the internal separation of ones self; the externall separation of another. And to conclude this Reply, with our true sense in this case, which you by your Arguments seem not willing hitherto to understand; He which separateth others unjustly from the Communion of the whole Church, separateth himself both from the externall Communion of those, whom he separateth, and from the internall Communion of those whom he separateth not; and makes himself further liable to be separated (by the just sentence of his Superiours) even from the externall*  
O. Commu-

290 *The Catholiques definition defended.*

*Communion of those also, whom he doth not at all pretend to separate. And if you should yet persist to think, that these separations (of this constitution) do no more introduce, or infer the one the other, then Hinnibility doth Risibility, or Colour, Sound; we delight not to appeal to the Auditors with a risum teneatis? though the joyning those two, Hinnibility and Risibility, the Poet judged a fit occasion for it in his Humano capiti cervicem equinam; but we will more soberly apply our selves to you, and with lesse noise, Dic, Quintiliane, colorem.*

C. 29.

The contradiction which you urge against us, in your Answer to our third Reason, is *null*. For the first proposition is to be understood (as we urged before, in the like case) *in sensu formali*; and so no unjust Excommunicator of others can be a Scismaticque, that is, *in quantum*, in so much onely as he is an unjust Excommunicatour: and the second proposition it taken *in sensu materiali*; it becoming schismaticall not precisely, because it is *unjust*, but because it ha's an adjunct joyned to it, which contains a voluntary separation of such an Excommunicatour  
from

from the Church, to wit, contempt and rejection of Catholique Communion. You discourse very intricately about the injustice of this act of excommunicating others for keeping due Catholique Communion; and say, That because this reason, for keeping Catholique Communion, is an unjust cause of Excommunication, therefore it is no accidentall adjunct to the injustice of the Excommunication done for that reason alone. We answer, by distinguishing two *Formalities* in excommunicating others for that reason. The first is of *Injustice*; the second, of *Hatred and Contempt* of Catholique communion. Standing precisely in that reason, as it is *onely unjust*, and no more, it is neither accidentall to that act, nor constitutive of the schismaticalnesse of it; but as considered under the *formality* of the Contempt of Catholique Communion, it is accidentall to the injustice of that act, as Metaphysicall reasons can be accidentall: that is, so long as it is considered under the formality of *Unjustice alone*, it will render the act *unjust*, though it had not the other *formality* of the Contempt of Catholique Communion. For an

*unjust act, qua talis*, may be *unjust*, though it have not that formality of Contempt adjoynd to it. This accidentall formality therefore of Contempt alone, *quâ talis*, renders that unjust Excommunication formally schismaticall. And by this distinction your difficulty is solved, and the Syllogisme answered. For I answer directly to your *Major*, by distinguishing something that was the unjust cause, or motive, rendred the Excommunication schismaticall, under the formality of the *Injustice* of it precisely, I deny it; under the formality of a Contempt of Church Communion contained in it, I grant your *Major*. And in like manner (granting your *Minor*) I distinguish your consequence. And that you may see the unefficaciousnesse of this your reasoning, I put you a like Syllogisme to yours, thus, in another matter like this wherein yours is framed; whereof even the unlearned are capable. Suppose that one, who holds, that every injurious Expulsion, or Banishment, of others, *ut talis*, meerly as it is an unjust Banishment, is Treason and Rebellion, against one, who acknowledges, that if it be done for this sole end,

because

because he, who is unjustly banished, keeps due Obedience to the chief Magistrate, and Fidelity to the Commonwealth, should use this Syllogisme to prove his Paradox, like in every respect of the form to yours. Something that was the unjust cause, or motive (in our supposed case) rendred the banishment rebellious: But whatsoever was the unjust cause, or motive (in our supposed case) rendred the banishment unjust: Therefore something that rendred the banishment unjust (in our supposed case) rendred it rebellious. Who sees not, that this Syllogisme, when it should conclude *in sensu formali*, or in an unjust banishment, as it is *unjust*, concludes onely *in sensu materiali*, as you do. Or in this very same matter of Schisme, I draw a contrary Conclusion to yours, out of a Syllogisme in the same form, *in sensu formali*.

Something that was a Contempt of Catholique Communion rendred the Excommunication schismaticall. But whatsoever was a Contempt of Catholique Communion rendred the Excommunication separative of the Excommunicatour from the visible Church. Therefore some-

thing that rendred the Excommunication  
 separative of the Excommunicatour from  
 the visible Church, rendred the Excom-  
 munication schismaticall. This Syllo-  
 gisme, framed of the very same act,  
 whereof yours was framed, infers legiti-  
 mately a contrary consequence, and that  
 truly and formally; which yours did one-  
 ly fallaciouſly and materially. Whence  
 you can never infer effectually, (as you  
 here do) that some schismaticallnesse is  
 produced by some unjust Excommunica-  
 tion, *as ſuch*: for neither have you the  
 term *as ſuch*, in your Syllogisme; nei-  
 ther can it follow from it, as we have  
 ſhewed. And hence alſo is clearly an-  
 ſwered your long Line pag. 18. and 19.  
 to prove this. For you neither have pro-  
 ved, nor can ever prove, that though the  
 unjust Excommunication there mention-  
 ed be inflicted for no other then an un-  
 juſt cauſe, that that unjust ~~cauſe~~ renders  
 the Excommunication ſchismaticall meer-  
 ly *quatenus tate, as ſuch*: Or, as it is un-  
 juſt, that is, for the *ſole injuſtice* of it, and  
 for no other *formality* comprized in it;  
 unleſſe you prove, that the reaſon, *viz.*  
 for keeping due Catholique Communion  
 hath

hath no other *formality* capable to render it schismaticall, save that *of iniustice*; which you have not proved it hath not, and we have proved it hath.

Your saying, *Pag. 33.* That he who separates others unjustly, separates himself involuntarily from the internal Communion of the lively members of Christs Body, &c. seems to us very strange Divinity. For if he voluntarily commit that sin of Unjustice, which he knows separates him essentially and formally from that internall Communion, with Christ and his lively members, how can he separate in that manner himself from them involuntarily? *Pag 33.* we call that motive of separating others, &c. for keeping due Catholique Communion *in genere cause finis*, because it is done in prosecution of his wicked Contempt of Catholique Communion, as a *medium* to attain the effecting of his schismaticall intentions, and participating of that objective malice, which this schismaticall Excommunicatour intends.

*Pag. 34.* We speak of one contradiction, and you of another. *Ibid.* To your demand, whether *ones self* be words of our



Definition or no, we answer, (as we have already done) that the word *one part* is to be understood of the person separating, and of no other, in the Definition of Schisme, and may connaturally be so understood in ours. *Fol. 30. P. 18.* your proving our Definition inconvertible, because there may be some Schisme, *viz.* unjust separation of another for keeping Catholique Communion, which is not a voluntary separation of ones self; might have been spared, if you had attended to our discourse in the fourth reason. For if, as we say there, *an active separation of others never be schismaticall, but when the reason adioyned to it includes essentially a separation of ones self, &c.* That separation so included must needs be voluntary; seeing the motive including it essentially, moves the Separatour to elicit freely and voluntarily that act. You have therefore hitherto given no direct answer at all to this fourth Reason. For the instance of *Firmilians* words import nothing, unlesse it be first proved, that *Steven* excommunicated them onely for this reason, because they kept due Catholique Communion; which neither is, nor can be

be proved. And as little your citing our words for the unvoluntarinesse of some separation from the Church; for neither speak we of a separation done for that sole reason.

Thus *P. 31.* \* you descend to your single and essentiall notion of Schisme, which we will defer, till we have briefly replied to what you say in confutation of our Arguments, because it requires, as being of main importance, a particular consideration.

*P. 31. num. 5.* Therefore we treated the not making good your Definition, to gain time, and contract this indirect difficulty about the nature of Schisme, with all speed (it being so much desired by the Auditory) and by way of prevention to avoid as long a Disputation about your Definition, as we have had, and are likely to have (if some means of Contraction be not provided) about ours. And therefore we said, that your Definition was not onely proved (for that might well have passed) but infringed by your Argument and instance against us: And therefore we say, That you can never make good, nor proceed consequently to your

298 *The Catholiques definition defended.*

*Definition, &c.* And the reason is, because that instance of some unjust separation of others, which if you have specified, concludes nothing against our Definition, as it is precisely under the formality of an unjust separation of others; but clearly convinces, that the reason, or formality, which makes it formally schismaticall, is the malice of separation of ones self contained in it; which malice respected in its formall concept, or notion, abstracts from all injustice to others, and may be found, where no injustice towards others by Ejection is committed. Now seeing that that very act, which you bring against our Definition, confirms it, what hope is there, that you can bring any to confirm yours. Your alledging therefore some unjust Ejection of others against our Definition, to be schismaticall; and that for a formality found there accidentally to the precise injustice of it, which is not found in all unjust Ejections of others, you have neither infringed our Definition, nor made good yours; nor proceeded consequently to it; which consequence required that you should, at least have produced some one  
unjust

unjust Ejection of others, which precisely by reason of the sole injustice of it done to another, is schismaticall; and then *à paritate rationis*, you would have confirmed your Definition, and proceeded consequently to it: For if for the sole injustice of it to others in that act it had been schismaticall, all and every, or any such unjust act would have been schismaticall, which is your Definition.

Fol. 31. p. 10. num. 1. To your first *à priori*, I answer, That an Argument *à paritate*, or *simili*, when it contains instances, which are known *à priori*, to have the like reason, that is in the thing to be proved, (as these are) are deservedly termed Arguments *à priori*. All our instances conclude alike; for all of them still remain united to the Body, as is manifest; which was all we offered to prove by this first Argument, as appears by our words, and you do not, nor cannot deny; which was directly against your position, *That he, who unjustly separates another, consequentially separates himself from the Church*: if you understand those last words of the visible Church, as I have shewed you did, and must do. The immediate

300 *The Catholiques definition defended.*

mediate difficulty therefore treated in this Argument (as in the rest) was not, whether such were Schismatiques or no, (which you incoherently and inappositely touch) but whether such were separated from the Bodies, to which they before belonged, which manifestly they are not.

---

**SECT.**

---

## S E C T. 4.

*How the word Church is to be understood in this Controversie about the Definition of Schisme.*

C. 30.

¶ I. *The first Argument.*

**A**Nd here you will give us leave to take notice of another passage of yours extorted from you by the force of Truth; viz. *We had indeed our selves granted, yea contended, that he also, which separateth others unjustly from the Church-Communion, doth thereby indeed (if not separate before) consequentially separate himself from the Church.* Thus you. Concerning which words, your proposition, *He which separateth others, &c.* if it be an universall proposition, (as it must be, if you will prove any thing or speak Logically) it must say thus much, *That every one, which separates another unjustly, &c. consequentially separates himself from the Church.* Whence will follow,  
first,

first, that if any lawful Bishop should out of spleen, or envy, excommunicate any subject of his for some pretended crime, which he knows to be false, that Bishop would consequentially separate himself from the Church, and become a formall Schismaticque, and so be no member of the true visible Church, much less a lawful Pastour of it; and that all who communicate with him, or acknowledge his Authority, become also Schismaticques: which consequence I think you will scarce follow.

P. 30.

To your first Argument we answer, That such a lawfull Bishop as you there describe, cuts himself off (as Firmilian said) by his envious, malicious, and unjust cutting off another from Christs Body, enjoying to that other due benefit (which you cannot deny, God and Christ allowed him) of Catholique Communion, and so doth separate himself, in some important sense, from the Body of Christ; viz. he becomes a dead member, and so an Equivocall, and so no member of Christs Body, that is, of the Church, in some proper acception of the Church: viz. as St. Paul, 1 Cor. 6. teaches.

That



That no member of an Harlot can be a member of Christ at the same time; and so not of his Body: which is enough to justify our Proposition drawn from the words of Firmilian. But when from thence you inferre, that Bishop to become no true member of the true visible Church, much lesse a lawfull Pastour of it, and that all which communicate with him become also Schismaticques, we deny the consequence. For that member of an Harlot (who may be, and oft is such secretly) which St. Paul saith, cannot be a member of Christ, and so not of his Body, may in another acception of the word Church, be a Bishop, or Pastour, in the visible Church: and they which communicate with him be so far from being guilty of Schisme thereby, that they would become schismaticall, if they refused to communicate with him.

C. 31.

Concerning your new acception of the word Church, as contradistinguished from the visible Church, for so you say pag. 27. num. 1. and 28. lin. 1. That a Pastor unjustly excommunicating another, though he separate himself from the Body of Christ, that is, of the Church, in some proper

*per* acception of the word Church, &c. may in another acception of the word Church, be a Bishop in the visible Church; we wonder exceedingly at so sudden and unexpected a change. For from the very first proposall of our Definition (wherein we made expresse mention of the visible Church) till this your present Reply, there was no other acception of the Church treated of, or mentioned amongst us, then of the visible Church. Secondly, you render your own Proposition dubious and equivocall, without any light given to understand the different acception of the word Church in it, and so not intelligible; which is this, *That he who separates others unjustly from the Church-communion, doth thereby consequentially separate himself from the Church.* For in the former part of this Proposition, Church is clearly taken for the visible Church; and in the latter, you take it for the invisible; that is, for the lively members of Christ. Thirdly, you make this proposition of yours to be false; for he that separates others unjustly, separates not himself from the body and lively members of Christ consequentially, but formally and primarily. For it

is as impossible to conceive, that an unjust person should be of the number of the just, as that an imprudent man should be of the number of the prudent. As therefore imprudence formally and primarily separates him from the number of the prudent, and not consequentially; so injustice separates this from the number of the just *formally and primarily*, but not *consequentially*. Fourthly, if you take Church in this your new sense, you make your discourse inconsequent. For you fell upon this proposition, by treating this saying of ours, *There is no active separation, save that of ones self, which can properly be termed Schisme*; whereupon you immediately adde these words, *We had indeed our selves granted, yea contended, that he also, which separates others, &c. doth thereby indeed, (if not separate before) consequentially separate himself from the Church*. Now seeing our words were clearly understood of a separtion from the visible Church, all consequence of doctrine required, that this separation of ones self from the Church should be understood of no other, *save the visible Church*: especially seeing you joyn the  
sense

sense of your Proposition to that of ours by the word *also*, saying, *We granted and contended, that he also, who separates others unjustly, &c. consequently separates himself from the Church.* Fifthly, your Proposition understood in this sense, is not proved, but disproved by the words of *Firmilian*, which you alledge in your confirmation of it. For the whole drift of *Firmilian* in that Epistle, is to dilate himself in the declaration of the visible Church; proving, that the Baptisme of Heretiques was *null*, because performed by those, who were out of the visible Church: and in the very words cited by you, he defines him to be a Schismaticque, *Who hath made himself an Apostate from the Communion of the Ecclesiastical Unity;* which words cannot be understood but of one separating himself from the Communion of the whole visible Church, (as you affirme in the explication of the formall reason of Schisme hereafter:) for all Ecclesiasticall Communion and Unity must be visible. Sixthly, your Proposition understood in this sense is made contradictory to your Definition of Schisme. For you say, *Schisme is any voluntary*  
*renting*

renting, or separating our selves, &c. from the body of Christ. Now though this be but a part of your Definition, yet you must assert it to be universally a true Proposition; for no false Proposition can be a part of a true Definition: therefore this proposition must be true, *Every voluntary renting, or separating our selves, &c. from the one Body of Christ must be Schisme.* But if you understand this said Proposition in this new acception of the the Church, there will be found a million of voluntary separations, and renting ones self from the one body of Christ, or the Church, which will not be Schisme; nor such separatours, or renters, Schismaticques; unlesse you grant, that every mortall Sin is a Schisme, and every mortall Sinner a Schismaticque: for all these separate themselves from Christ and his lively body, which you here define to be meant by the word *Church*, as appears manifestly by your citing 1 Cor. 6. for the sin of Fornication so separating; and if that, *à paritate rationis*, all other mortall sins. Lastly, hence appears, that as we before affirmed, you were constrained by the force of Truth to advance the said

Propo-

Proposition, so may we now affirm, that the same Truth hath put you upon a necessity to give this unexpected interpretation of it: which though for the present it might seem to shift off our Arguments, yet it will now appear to have brought more inconveniencies and difficulties with it, then were those, which you endeavoured to avoid by it. Upon the settling therefore the understanding, in the second part of your said Proposition, by the word *Church*, no other, save the visible Church, whereof we have hitherto treated, our Arguments returne to their first force, and require another solution, then what you have given to them. And all your solutions depending upon this your new acception of the Church, lose all force to solve our Arguments, because they become ineffectual by proceeding upon a false ground; and so require no answer at all from us, till our present oppugnation of the ground of them be infringed.

C. 32.

¶ 2. *The second Argument, concerning the Bishop of Rome being a part of the visible Church.*

Secondly, hence will follow, that seeing the Bishop of *Rome* and all Prelates, who communicate with him; and the Bishop of *Constantinople*, and all the Bishops and Pastours of his party, either, *à jure*, or, *ab homine*, excommunicate all, who hold many of your Tenets against them; and have done so, at least since the great Council of *Lateran*, that for these four hundred years all those Bishops and Pastours have been separated consequently from Christs true visible Church; and by consequence, that all the people of those Churches, by communicating with them, as their lawfull Pastours, became also Schismatiques, and separated from the true visible Church: whence lastly follows, that both the East and West Churches have been false Schismaticall Churches for so many Ages; and neither the true Church, nor members of the  
true



true Church of Christ: which is both clearly contrary to the professed Tenets of your late Doctors, under the notion of Protestants, and highly Calvinisticall, and destructive of the true Church of Christ, both in the Eastern and Western World.

*P. 32.*  
*As to that part of your second Argument against our Proposition, wherein you affirm, that the Bishop of Constantinople, and all the Bishops and Pastors of his party, excommunicate all who hold many of our Tenets against them, and have done so at least ever since the great Council of Lateran, that is, these four hundred years; we require you to prove it if you can. This to say, if you be not able to shew why you adventure to object it to us, is to serve your Hypothesis even by highly offending against Charity Ecclesiasticall; (which yet this whole conference of ours should principally aim to preserve) by sowing seeds of Discord and Disunion betwixt the Churches of Christ and the true Members of his Body. Whereas it is on the other side apparently true, that that Patriarch yearly excommunicates your selves for Schismatiques*  
*at*

is here to be understood.

311

at least ; which is all we need to return upon you ; as to our question at this time : And that your Roman Bishop Schismatically yearly excommunicates him, and the Bishops and Pastors of his party. And so the East and West Churches are miserably divided, and rent asunder from each other through your fault ; and not by any colour of consequence from our proposition. And this, those, whom you call the old Protestants (never impeached as Calvinisticall) have ever laid to your charge.

C. 33.

You determine nothing in answer to our instance of the Western or Roman Church, which we made against your Proposition, whether it be mortally Schismaticall, and consequently separate from the true visible Church of Christ or no, which was the main important point to our present Question ; and we expected, and yet expect, a full determinate answer about it ; viz. Whether the Roman Church, both now, and ever since the Council of *Lateran*, be so consequentially separate by reason of her pretended unjust Excommunication of you, and those who hold any of your Opinions against

against her, that she hath had no true Bishops, or Pastours, in her, this four hundred years last past. Answer we pray punctually to this, and where will be your Church then?

Concerning the Eastern Churches excommunicating ever since the great Council of *Lateran*, those who held some or other of your Opinions, we answer, that it is manifest to have been so, even from the Council of *Lateran* it self. For after it had defined Transubstantiation to be a point of Faith, and thereby condemned the contrary Opinion to be Heresie, as also the *Albigenses*, who held many of your opinions against the Roman Church to be Heretiques, &c. It excommunicates all Heretiques, all Heretiques whatsoever, and so by consequence all those who held some Opinions with you against the Roman Church. Now at that time two of the Greek Patriarchs in person, and two by their Legates, were present in that Council, with many of their inferiour Bishops, who all then reconciled themselves to the Roman Church, and subjected themselves to the Bishop of *Rome*; and so much in all reason account that  
Council

Council to have been lawfull, and obligatory as well to them, as to those of the Latine Church. Therefore either they are to be supposed to attribute obligatory force to the Canons of that Council, and so to maintain ever since the Excommunications inflicted and ordained in it, as *Excommunications à jure*, or to have quitted their Obedience to a lawfull Generall Council: which if it be so, they are to be esteemed no better then Schismatiques, and so no more a part of the true visible Church; (as we have proved) and then it matters not whom they excommunicate, or excommunicate not. And by this our Proposition will be true, that they have had no lawfull Bishops this four hundred years, either by allowing and maintaining the Excommunications of the Council of *Lateran*, which you esteem unjust and separative from the Church, (which we have proved must be the visible Church) or, since their rejection of that Council, in becoming Schismatical, by rejecting the Authority of a lawfull Generall Council.

Now to give further satisfaction about the state and proceeding of the Greek  
P Church,

Church, in regard of Protestants since *Luthers* time, you need no more evidence then the answer of *Hieremias* Patriarch of *Constantinople*, to the Articles sent him from the Lutherans, drawn from the Confession of *Augusta*, which he condemned and rejected one after another; viz. all those wherein they opposed the Roman Church, save onely that of the Popes present Supremacy, as Novelties, Errors in Faith, and contrary to the Universall, Ancient, and Apostolicall Traditions; and thereupon denies to communicate with them, unlesse they revoked those Errours. And that you may not think, that either the Latine Translation of *Scocolovius* is false, or that we have altered the Greek Text of *Hieremias*, you may please to peruse *Acta Theologorum Wittembergensium & Hieremie Patriarchæ Constantinopolitani, de Augustanâ Confessione*, printed at *Wittemberge Anno 1584.* where these Divines of *Wittemberge* acknowledge, that the Greek Church differs from those of the *Augustine Confession* in fourteen Points now controverted betwixt Protestants, and those of the Church of *Rome*. And Sir *Edwyn Sands*  
in

in his Relation of the state of Religion used in the West parts of the World, towards the end of his Book, affirmeth, that the Greek Church concurreth with them at *Rome* in *Transubstantiation*, Sacrifice of Masse, Prayer to Saints, Auricular Confession, Sacrifice and Prayer for the Dead, Purgatory, Worshipping of Images, &c. Now seeing they hold these and the like Points as Points of Faith, universally and continually believed amongst Christians, it is manifest, that they condemne the contrary as novell Heresies, and so account and detest the maintainers of them as Heretiques, and exclude them from all Christian Communion with them.

What you say of the Greek Churches yearly excommunicating those of the Latine Church, makes against your self; nay, and proves them to be Schismaticques, more then any Evidence you can bring will prove those of the Roman Church to be so. For in that annuall Excommunication; they excommunicate all Protestants, as well as Roman Catholiques, for holding the Proceſſion of the holy Ghost from the Father and the Son; which is

the chief quarrell which they have against the Latine Church. For this is acknowledged by all the Latines, both you and us, to be a most unjust Excommunication, seeing it is for maintaining a Christian Catholique Truth. Thus then by your opposition to our Argument, you have given us occasion, not onely to defend, but to strengthen and confirme it; viz. That you must hold the Grecians Schismatiques, according to your present principles, not onely for unjustly excommunicating you for holding Opinions against the Roman Church, but also for holding the Procession of the holy Ghost, against them, with the Roman Church.

P. 33.

*Next you tell us, we determine nothing in answer to your instance of the Western, or Roman, Church, (where by the way we advertise you, your meting out the Western or Roman Church, as of one measure, is not admitted by us as proper speaking, or true; viz. as that the Roman and Western Church are such terms, as that the latter adequately interprets the former: so far are we from admitting Roman to be all one with the Universall, or Catholike one Church*



*Church of Christ; and which if it were, it would therefore also not be adequate with the Western.*

C. 34.

It imports little what you now think of the inadequatenesse of the terms, *Roman and Western Church*; for we speak of them as they were understood in the time of the Council of *Lateran*, and ever since, till you Protestants made a division from the Roman. Was not, in all that tract of time, the Roman, as a Patriarchall Church, (for so onely we treat it here) and the Western Church of the same extension? Name any one visible and Hierarchicall Church in the West, which was not subject to the Roman Patriarch, in all that time, and accounted it self a part of the Roman Patriarchate, and as subject to the Bishop of *Rome*, as to their lawfull Patriarch, as any other Provinces and particular Churches in the East esteemed themselves subject to their respective Patriarchs: not that the Roman Bishop had any limited Patriarchate allotted him in any Council, or by force of any Canon, or Tradition, as the others had, or that he was *formally* a Patriarch,

but onely v̄rtually, as containing eminently in his universall Jurisdiction, all inferiour Dignities; and therefore termed Patriarch of the West, because in all the Western Tract, there was no other, who had anciently a Patriarchall Dignity and Power over those of the West, under the Roman Bishop, but he governed all the particular Western Churches immediately, without committing the Patriarchal Jurisdiction of them to any Bishop of the West: so that in all cases according to the Canons, wherein the Patriarchs of the East exercised Jurisdiction over the Bishops, Metropolitanes and Primate, in their severall Patriarchates, the Bishop of Rome exercised the same over those of the West.

P. 34.

*Your instance was this, that if we say, that every one, who separates another unjustly, &c. consequently separates himself from the Church; it will follow, say you, that seeing the Bishop of Rome, and all Prelates who communicate with him, excommunicate all, who hold many of our Tenets against them, and have done so at least ever since the great Councel of Lateran, they*

they would consequentially be separate from the Church, and so that Church have no true Bishop or Pastors in her, these four hundred years last past. To this your instance, you say, we determine nothing. If you affect not tedious diversion from the Thesis, whereabout we now controvert, to the Hypothesis, and particular case 'twixt Rome an us, (from which we are the longer kept off, by such inartificiall precipitation, and confused huddling of Thesis and Hypothesis together) you cannot but acknowledge, that we have given you sufficient answer, (till you disprove it.) First you know and take knowledge, that we declare our selves not to mean, that every unjust Excommunicatour of others doth thereby become no Member, no Bishop, or Pastour of the visible Church. Secondly we have told you, that such Bishop, or Pastours, as who are cut off from being any lively members of Christs lively mysticall Body by their wickedness, yet may remain so properly true Bishops and Pastours of the Church, as that it should be Schisme for any under them to withdraw their subjection from them, and consequently Schismaticall to deny them to be true Bishops and Pastours;

since both these Propositions, you know, are our declared minde, and that from these two every meanest understanding can collect, that though all the Western, or Roman, Bishops (as you speak) in the Councel of Lateran (which, as you say, so excommunicated all that hold many of our Tenets) should be by us yielded, at your instance, as mortally Schismaticall, to have been cut off from the Church, (that is, you know, in our declared sense, from being members of Christs live-mysticall Body;) and since we are not by any Logick or common Reason obliged to make good our Propositions in your sense, but in that which was ours, and which before this your Replication we declared to be ours; yet though so ceasing to be living members of Christs mysticall Body, they would not cease to be truly Bishops and Pastors of the Church, though wicked ones, and therefore might give valid Ordination to our Bishops in King Henry the Eighth his time neverthelesse: And so to your question, And where will your Church be then? We answer, And where is your Argument now become? Our Church is where it was, had valid Ordination from true Bishops; though you inferre from our  
Propo-

*Proposition, that they were wicked ones; and so no live-members of Christs mysticall Body. We pray, might not Judas Iscariot, when sent by Christ, make Children of God by Christs Baptisme, when himself was a childe of the Devil? Will you question all the Ordinations made by such Popes, as Baronius; and all good men acknowledge to have been wicked? and yet this is not half the weaknesse of this your instance upon us.*

*C. 35.*

It was obvious enough to gather, what in consequence of Doctrine you ought to have said of the Roman Bishop, and all other Bishops and Churches adhering to them; but because, (considering your many inconstancies and inconsequences already laid open) we had no reason to suppose, that you would say in this main important difficulty what your principles require you should say, we had reason to exact from you a direct answer, whereby it might appear, not what you ought to say, but whether you say *de facto*, what you ought to say. And our expectation in this has now obtained what we intended. You affirm therefore here, enforced

to it by our pressing for a direct and open answer, that the Bishops of *Rome*, and all the Prelates which communicate with them, notwithstanding the pretended unjust Excommunication of you, and of whomsoever held many of your Tenets against them, ever since the great Council of *Lateran*, cease not to be truly Bishops and Pastors of the Church, *though wicked ones*, as you say; and that *it should be Schisme for any under them, to withdraw their subjection from them.* And that they have a true and lawfull Authority over their Subjects in the Church, and as much power to governe Christians, and exercise their Ecclesiastical Functions amongst them, as had *Judas Iscariot*, before his deserting Christ and his Apostles, and many wicked Popes (as you suppose) over the Christians subject to them in their respective times and districts. This is indeed a clear and open Confession, and all we desired from you: But look now that you stand close to it, and make no deviation, when further occasion requires, that it be prest against you. For hence will follow, first, that all the Christians within the particular Diocese of the Bishop  
of

of *Rome* would be truly Schismatiques, and that in the acception of our definition, if they yielded not obedience to the Bishop of *Rome* ever since the Council of *Lateran*. Secondly, hence will follow, that all those, who were under the Western Patriarch, were mortally and grievously Schismatiques, who have relinquished the obedience of the Bishop of *Rome* from the Council of *Lateran*, till the beginning of Protestants, upon pretence of his unjust Excommunication of them for holding any opinions with you against the Roman Church. Thirdly, that seeing the differences in matters of Faith betwixt us, are not, as yours now contend, destructive of Christian Faith; and so are consistent with a true Church of Christ, and the true Bishops of it; it will follow, that the first beginners of Protestancy and consequently all the rest successively siding with them, by substracting themselves from the obedience and communion of the Roman Bishop in these Western parts, were and are formal Schismatiques. Fourthly, that even though it were supposed, that some Protestants were not under the obedience of  
the



the Bishop of *Rome*, when they made their separation from him, and those who communicated with him; and so would not have been Schismatiques by denying obedience to him; yet seeing he (in this your concession) remains a true and lawfull Bishop of the visible Church, they are Schismatiques by violating the Communion of Coordination with him, and dividing themselves from him, and all that communicate with him, into a separate body. Fifthly, hence followes, that all those, who substracted their Obedience from their lawfull Bishops in every Nation respectively, as *Luther* did in *Germany*, *Calvin* and his in *France*, *Knox* and his in *Scotland*, *Parker* and his in *England*, &c. upon pretence that their respective Bishops maintained the Religion and Communion with the Bishop of *Rome*, were truly and mortally Schismatiques; and that in the same degree with those, who should have separated themselves from *Judas*, whilest he remained an Apostle; or from the lawful Bishops of *Rome*, whilest they were onely wicked in their lives: and consequently such Separators of themselves, even according to your Prin-

*is here to be understood.*

323

Principles, were to be as much avoided by all good Christians, as were the Donatists, Acacians, &c. and it were Schisme to communicate with them. Thus then you see what reason we had to presse you to declare your mindes fully and clearly concerning our objection of the Roman Bishops and their adherents ever since the great Council of *Lateran*.

P. 35.

¶ 3. *Concerning the Authority of the fourth Council of Lateran.*

*For if we had a minde to follow you in confounding and mingling the question in Thesi (which yet findes you and us business enough) with that question in Hypothesi, whether the Roman Church be mortally Schismaticall or no? (for that you say, The Western Bishops in the Lateran Council excommunicated all that hold many of our Tenets) we would so far take up the defence of the Lateran Council against you; and being resolved to be charitable to those who pursue us for it, and can justifie that our charity by not suffering what you please*

to be obtruded upon us : we (we say) would and do (if you think this a seasonable place for it) require you to prove, if you can, that though the Pope and his nearer adherents would, perhaps, that some of the Doctrines now held by us, should have been, then Anathematized, that yet the Councel ever consented to those Canons. In the meantime we, who believe, no proof can be brought of it, lest the Auditors should meet in this matter with nothing but Affirmations and Requisition of proof, but no proof either way; we offer our proof of the contrary; viz. That though those Canons, made, as we conceive, by Pope Innocent the Third, were by his Command read openly and propounded in that Councel, yet that Councel did not consent unto them.

## C. 36.

Here you require a clear proof, that the Councel of *Lateran* consented to the Canons, which were publicly read (as you confesse out of *Matthew Paris*, and are yet extant in it : and we bring a seven-fold proof out of the very words of the Canons themselves, that the whole Councel consented to them. For Canon the 2, 4, 5, 8, 48, 50, 67. they say, that  
what:

what they defined there, was decreed *sacro approbante, suadente, Concilio..... Statutus esse regulas in hoc generali Concilio... Sancti Patres provide statuerunt..... Ex approbatione sacri Concilii.... Synodali decreto statuimus.....* All which signifie, that those Canons were decreed by the consent of that Council. Now to this most manifest and irrefragable proof nothing can be said; then that either these and the like clauses were not extant in the said Canons, when they were read in the Council, but corruptly added to them by Pope *Innocent* the Third, or by his Adherents afterward: and this must be clearly proved; for till it be proved, possession stands for the sincerity and purity of those Canons. For otherwise the Canons of all Councils may at every ones pleasure be refused, as corrupted by others: or it must be said, that when those Canons were read in the Council, they had the said clauses in them; and then, if the Council consented not (as you asseirme) to those Canons, you must prove, that the Bishops contradicted the said clauses as false and injurious, either in the Council itself, or (if you pretend that they

they were deterred by fear of offending Pope *Innocent*) presently after the Council, when they were returned to their respective Sees, and had their Freedom, and Patronage of their Princes, especially those of the East Church; who were out of all fear, or possibility to be imprisoned, or deprived of their Bishopricks by the Pope, for declaring that abuse; they not having given a sufficient consent to them, nor the Council approving them; and so requiring that those clauses, as surreptitious, should be blotted out of the Canons: which notwithstanding you neither have proved, nor can prove, seeing they stand still in the Canons; and you can shew no Authentick Copy of them, which hath not those clauses in them; or that the Bishops there present excepted against them. We have therefore out of the expresse words of the Canons, seven times over, that the Council *did consent to them*; which is our Assertion.

Our first Argument therefore against this your new hatched Paradox, *That the Council of Lateran never consented to those 70 Canons*, is the expresse words of the

the Canons themselves, read publicquely before the Councel, affirming seven times over, that they consented, approved, and enacted those severall Canons, wherein those clauses are inserted; and if those, no question can be made of the rest. Secondly, we prove the Councils consent, in that the said Canons, when *Gregory* the ninth, a most learned Pope, (as *Spondannus* terms him, and all know he was) with the assistance of *Raymundus* a learned Dominican, composed the five Books of Decretalls, were put, with diverse other Canons and Decrees of generall Councils and Popes, into the said Books, and stand to this day in them, under the Notion and Titles of the Canons of the fourth Councell of *Lateran*, under *Innocentius* the third; no otherwise, then do the Canons of other Councils, under the Titles of the Councils wherein they were respectively; and ever since received by all those, who either commented upon those Decretals, or studied the Canon-Law, as the genuine Canons of that Councell, excepting no more against them, then they do against the Decrees there cited of any other Councils. And we  
challenge

challenge any one of your party to shew, that any Authour, Counsellour, or Student in the Canon-Law, ever excepted against these Canons, inserted by *Gregory* the ninth into the Decretalls, as Canons of that Councell, more then against any other cited in the five Books of Decretalls. And yet further, seeing that many Bishops, or other Prelates were probably still living, when those Canons were put into the Decretalls, as Decrees of this Council of *Lateran*, some of them would certainly have discovered that imposture, and openly complained of it; and some Authours would have taken notice of the exception of such Bishops, and recorded them; which never was done by any Authour in the world. The inserting therefore those Canons equally with the rest of other Councils into the Decretalls so soon after that Council, and the general acception of them through all Christendom, as the Canons of that Council so inserted, is as strong and invincible an Argument, that they were the genuine Canons decreed by sufficient consent of Bishops in that Councell, as is the publique inserting the Acts of our English Parliaments into



into the Statute-Books of *England*, under such a King, and in such a Parliament, universally received by all Lawyers and Judges in *England* without contradiction, to proves that such Acts are the genuine, true Acts of such Parliaments, enacted by sufficient consent under such Kings. And as he, who notwithstanding such a proof, should maintain, that they were not consented to by such Parliaments, would be esteemed by all sober and prudent men, to be transported rather with Frenzie, then guided by reason; so to call in question, what is solemnly inserted into the *Statute-book* of the Church, would seem to all equall judgments to have much more of passion, then reason; to say no more.

Our third Argument, is the continuall Tradition of all Classique Authours, who treat of Transubstantiation, and of the obligation of Annuall Confession, &c. who cite *Cap. firmiter*, and *Cap. omnes utriusque*, as Decrees of the Council of *Lateran*, in the same Tenor and Title, as they are inserted into the Book of Decretals. Thus *Gulielmus Antisiodorensis*, who flourished *Anno 1240.* twenty five years after

after the *Lateran Council*, witnesses, fol. 271. *Quest. Utrum quis differre possit confessionem, &c.* That all are obliged by the Church to receive the holy Sacrament at Easter, and consequently to Confesse, which is the command of this *Lateran Council*. *Cap. omnes utriusque. St. Tho. of Aquin* in the Year 1265. about fifty years after this Council, 3. part. Art. 3. in *Corp.* speaking of the Churches Precept of Annual Confession, sayes, *Et sic tenemur ex Institutione Ecclesie editâ in Concilio Generali sub Innocentio tertio*, which is the said Chapter. *Ricardus de mediâ Villâ* in the Year 1290. seventy five years after the Council, fol. 105. lib. 4. dist. 17. *quest. 9.* cites the same Chapter out of the Decretals of *Gregory the Ninth* at length, for Annual Confession; upon which he resolves many other questions, concerning the true sense of the said words. *Scotus Anno 1300.* 85. years after the Council in 4°. *Nunc autem Romana Ecclesia tenet panem Transubstantiari, &c. Sicut manifestè habetur, Extrav. de summâ Trinitate*; and then quotes the words of that Canon of the Council of *Lateran. Cap. firmiter.*

*Nicolaus*

*Nicolaus de Orbellis, Anno 1455.* two hundred and forty years after the Council, in 4°. *Dist. 11. Quæst. 1. fol. 27.* cites the same *Cap. firmiter*, for Transubstantiation.

Our fourth Testimony is from the Authentickall Historians, who writ in and next after the Council of *Lateran*. *Abbas Urspergensis*, who lived in the very time of this Council, in the year 1215. styles it, *Sancta & Universalis Synodus*, A holy General Council; (and *Matthew Paris*, cited hereafter by you, gives it the very same title.) Now how could it be a holy General Council, in their judgments, if they judged, that the Canons, which (as you acknowledge) were publickly read in it, as decreed by it, were disavowed by the Bishops of the said Council, either Latine or Greek, either in the Council it self, or after it was dissolved, when they were returned to their Sees. For seeing that neither any of them, either in, or presently after the Council, ever complained of any such dealing by *Innocentius*, when they were in full liberty to do it, especially those of the Eastern Church, being returned home, it is manifest,

fest, that either there was no such matter, or that all the Bishops of that Council were wilful seducers of the whole Church, in obtruding upon them false Canons, as rules of Faith and Discipline.

P. 36.

*In proof whereof, first we alledge the witness of Matthew Paris, an Historian of that time; a man of approved life and experienced Religion, by the Testimony of Innocentius quartus. This Matthew Paris testifying a dissent and division of the Council about them, but none testifying an agreement, or consent of all, or of the major part to them: His words in rege Joanne ad Annum 1215. pag. 262. are these. His omnibus congregatis in suo loco præfato, & juxta morem Conciliorum Generalium in suis ordinibus singuli collocatis, facto prius ab ipso Papa exhortationis sermone, recitata sunt in pleno Concilio 60. (alias 70.) Capitula; Quæ aliis placabilia, aliis videbantur onerosa: Tandem de negotio crucifixi & subjectionis Terræ Sanctæ verbum prædicationis exorsus, subjunxit, dicens, &c. Here's Division about them; aliis placabilia, aliis videbantur onerosa; and tandem, &c.*  
*Here*

Here appears no coalition, or consent upon them; but a Sermon followes about the vanquishing of the Holy Land, wherein they might and did better agree.

C. 37.

Now prove you by as expresse words from any Claſſique Author, that the Council did not consent to them, which is your Assertion; and be ſure now that you make it good, otherwise you will be found Traducers of all the Fathers of that Council, and insufferably of that holy and learned Pope *Innocentius* the Third. You alledge for your proof, first, the words of *Matthew Paris* here cited. But sayes *Matthew Paris* here, as expreſly as the Canons themselves say the contrary, that the Council did not consent to them? Where finde you those words in this place of *Matthew Paris*? Say they at least, that the *major* part of the Bishops consented not to them? Where finde you that expreſſed in them? Nay, say they expreſly, that at least some of the Bishops consented not to them? not so much as one expreſſe word of this neither. Can it therefore be inferred by any Logically, or valid consequence, that any of these parti-

336.      *Of the Authority of the*  
particulars can be deduced from them?  
let us try that.

His words cited by you are these. *His omnibus congregatis in suo loco prefato, & juxta morem Conciliorum Generalium singulis in suis ordinibus collocatis, facto prius ab ipso Papa Exhortationis Sermone, recitata sunt in pleno Concilio, 60. (al. 70.) Capitula; quæ aliis placabilia, aliis videbantur onerosa. Tandem de negotio Crucifixi & subjectionis Terra Sanctæ verbum prædicationis exorsus subjunxit, dicens, &c.*  
“ All these being assembled in their fore-  
“ said place, and constituted in their  
“ Ranks, or Orders, according to the  
“ custome of General Councils, the Pope  
“ himself having first made an Exhorta-  
“ tion, in the full Council were recited  
“ 60. Chapters (*al. 70.*) (say you, which  
“ *Matthew Paris* sayes not) which seem-  
“ ed pleasing to some, and burthensome  
“ to others: Lastly, beginning a Sermon  
“ about the Crucifix, and recovering of  
“ the holy Holy Land, he said, &c. Now  
this Author in the next precedent words  
to these relates, that there were in this  
Council onely 412. Bishops, whereof 77.  
were Metropolitans, and 800. Abbots  
and

and Priors; and then sayes, *His omnibus congregatis, &c.* All these assembled, &c. and after, that when each of them was set in his proper ranke and place, *in pleno Concilio, &c.* these 60. Chapters. were recited in full Councell; and then adds, *Quæ aliis placabilia, &c.* which seemed pleasing to some, and burthensome to others: Ergo, say you, *Matthew Paris* sayes, that the Council consented not, nor the major part of the Bishops, to these Chapters, or Canons. How appeares that? Might not these words of his be true, though all the Bishops, much more the major part of them, had consented to the said Canons? Were there not eight hundred Abbats and Priors there, and many other Legates of Emperours, Kings and Princes, in a very great number in the Council, to whom these Canons might seem burthensome; though they seemed pleasing and just to those, who onely had decisive voices in the Council? Seeing therefore he sayes not, *aliis ex Episcopis*, but onely absolutely, *aliis placabilia, aliis videbantur onerosa*: To some they seemed pleasing, and to others burthensome: and amongst these, three parts of four were

Q

not



not Bishops. By what rule of Logique can you restrain those words to the Bishops, or those, of whose voyces the Decrees of the Council depended? But let us not be nice with you. Suppose we admitted, not granted, that those words were understood of the Bishops; might not all be true that *Matthew Paris* sayes, and yet a sufficient *major* part of the Council consented to those Canons? For suppose that to 150. of those Bishops the said Canons seemed *burthensom*, and to 250. they seemed *pleasing*, would not what *Paris* sayes be true; *aliis placabilia, aliis videbantur onerosa*; which seemed to *some* pleasing, and to *some* burthensom? Is not this an ordinary practice in Councils, and Parliaments, Elections, &c. where Voices are divided, and yet the *major* part carries it; that the things propounded *aliis videntur placabilia, aliis onerosa*? To some pleasing, and to other burthensome.

But that it may plainly appear, that those words cannot be understood of the *major* part of the Bishops, we demand, whether these words, *Quae aliis videbantur, &c.* be understood of all the Chapters,

ters, or Canons of that Councel, none excepted, and of every part and parcell of them; or onely *in sensu accommodo*, of some, or some parts of them. It is evident, they cannot be understood universally of all, and of every part of those Canons; for in the first Chapter is defined the Unity and Trinity of God: and in the second, the quaternity of persons held by Abbot *Joachim*, is condemned: to say nothing of many others, which could not seem burthensome to any of those Catholique Bishops, much lesse to the *major* part of them. When therefore *Matthew Paris* sayes *quæ aliis, &c.* he must be understood to speak in a prudent morall sense, that amongst those 60. Canons, some seemed *burthensome* to certain persons in the Councel. Now seeing the words of *Matthew Paris* cannot be absolutely understood of all, you will never be able to conclude, that what makes against you, was not defined by sufficient consent of the Councel; unless you prove first, that those Canons, which condemned some of your Tenets, were comprehended under the number of those, which seemed burthensome; which can never

be done by these words of *M. Paris*, understood not to reach absolutely to them all. For there will still be ground to reply, that they reached not to what was against you. Seeing therefore the words of *Paris* must be limited to some number, or rank of them, we must now see, whether his words give any ground to determine, to what sort of Canons he referred them. Now there were Canons of two sorts in that Council; the one concerning matters of Christian Faith, as in the 1, 2, 3, &c. the other concerning Ecclesiasticall Discipline, or reformation of Manners, as are most of the Chapters following. This supposed, we say, that the words of this Author are connaturally and properly to be understood of the second kinde onely: for had he spoken of matters touching Faith, it had been fit to have used this expression, *Quæ aliis falsa vel incerta, aliis vera & certa videbantur*; which seemed false and uncertain to some, and true and certain to others. For matters concerning Faith are defined by reason of their truth and certainty; and Errors or Novelties obtruded, as matters of Faith, are properly stiled false and uncertain,

tain, not burthensome or distastefull. But contrariwise matters of Discipline and Reformation are properly *burthensome* to such as require liberty; and *pleasing* to such as require perfection: and even to prudent men, strictness of Ecclesiasticall Discipline may seem *burthensome*, when they fear it will not be embraced by the greater part of the Clergy, or Religious person; or cause Revolts or Divisions in the Church. If you should hence inferre, that this Authors words prove, that at least those Canons touching Discipline were not consented to by the Council, we answer, it follows not. For if we consider attentively the words of the Council, in pronouncing so often over (as we proved) that these Canons were decreed by the consent and approbation of the Council, when they were publicquely recited, as *Matthew Paris* sayes, *in pleno Concilio*, in full Council; reason will teach us, that the said Canons were voted and decreed by a sufficient number of those, who had power of voting in the Council, before they were thus publicquely recited. For if those Definitours had not before agreed about them, and de-

fin'd them, how could they say with truth, that those Canons were concluded by consent and approbation of the whole Council. For had they been publicly recited before they had been defined, it had not then been true, that they were approved, when they were recited before the whole Council: for their approbation in this supposition was not then given, but it expected, what would be decreed about them, after they were thus recited. So that this publique recitation of them mentioned by *Matthew Paris*, was a Publication, and not a Definition of the said Canons: and this Publication being made *in pleno Concilio*, in full Council, where not onely the Bishops and Definitors, but many hundreds of inferiour Prelates, Clerks, and Lay-persons (as this Author affirms) were present, who had no right in voting; many of the said strict and severe Canons might have seemed *burthenfome* to some, and *pleasing* to others in that multitude; as it is very ordinary, when so many different dispositions and humours of persons are assembled together, though they had been fully determined by the Definitors before.

But

But we have not done with you yet. You acknowledge presently, that *Matthæw Paris* thought this Council of *Lateran* to be a *Generall Council*, and you should have added, as he did, a *holy Generall Council*; for so he terms it in this very place, *Sancta & Universalis Synodus*. Now had these Canons (which you would draw from his words) never been consented to by the Council, and yet recited publicly before it, as having been decreed by the full approbation of it, it would rather have been a mock Council, then a *holy General Council*, he therefore must necessarily have thought, notwithstanding those his words, *aliis placabilia, &c.* that they were sufficiently decreed and approved by the Council; and that they were then read in full Council, not as to be defined after that reading, but as to be published to the whole Council, as its Canons fully decreed by the Bishops, before that publique recitation. And though when they were thus publicly known to all, many of those strict and severe Canons of Order and Discipline might seem to no small number of the inferior Prelates and Lay-persons, *burthen-*

*some*; yet hence follows not, that these persons rejected them; but onely that they thought them heavy, and yet yielded to the burthen of them, seeing they were so enacted by that holy General Council. Thus your first Reason is wholly fallen to the ground; let us now see how you will hold up your second.

## P. 37.

*Secondly, we subjoyn this violent prejudice against those Canons, that they were never consented unto; in that your own Collectors of the Tomes of Councils have not been able, (which they would not have failed to do, if they could have done it) to produce any Subscriptions of any Greek, yea, or any Western Bishops or others at all, in the end of this Council, of these Canons, or at the end of any Act, or part of Act of it; as we are ready to shew in all acknowledged Generall Councils, (such as this is pretended to be, yea, and Matthew Paris thought it was) the Subscriptions of the Patriarchs and Bishops at the end of their Acts; in every one, we say, of the seven acknowledged General Councils. But in this of the Great Lateran, no such thing appears; no Subscriptions could ever be produced.*



C. 38.

Your second Argument is this, there is no mention of Subscriptions of Bishops in this Council; therefore the Counsel consented not to the Canons: which is as good a consequence as this; There is no mention made in the Council of the Apostles in the *Acts*, of any Subscriptions to the Canons of that Council; therefore that Counsel consented not to those Canons: Or, as this, there is no mention made of Subscriptions by the Collectours of the Tomes of Councils, in the five Generall Councils of *Lateran*, nor in some others; therefore none of those Councils consented to the Canons, or Definitions, related by Authentickall Testimony, to have been made in them. This way of drawing consequences is indeed a very easie one to elude the force of General Councils, if any prudent man would be seduced by it. Seeing therefore this your Argument either proves too much, or nothing, every open eye will at the first sight discover the weaknesse of it. But, say you, in the first seven General Councils there were Subscriptions. What then? *Ergo*, where

Q 5.

there

there are no subscriptions, there is no consent of the Council? This must be your consequence, or nothing; which is as good an Argument as this. The first seven General Councils were celebrated in the Eastern Church: Therefore whatsoever Council is not celebrated in the Eastern Church, is no General Council. Subscriptions, Acclamations, &c. are (as all know) not precedent causes, but subsequent signes of the consent of Councils; and so are to be added when they are necessary, not otherwise. Now as all the first seven General Councils were celebrated in the East, because the chief Heresies, which they condemned, begun and prevailed in the East: so they required particular Subscriptions of those Bishops which were present in them, (who were most part of them Eastern Bishops) to give Authentick Testimony to the Church, that they Anathematized those Heresies. But when Councils were gathered either for Reformation in Manners, or for Condemnation of some small particular new-born Heresies, which had not infected any considerable part, or any chief Pastours of the Church, (as those  
Ancient

Ancient Heresies did) this formality of Subscriptions was not so precisely necessary, and therefore was not so punctually observed; especially when the Bishops of *Rome* were present in person, as they were in those *Lateran* Councils: whose testimony of the consent of the Bishops (being an eye-witnesse of it) was in those dayes, (when they were held to be chief Pastors of the Catholique Church) sufficient to make their consents to be believed through the whole Church. Thus we see, that not onely in the seven first Generall Councils, but in that of *Florence* and *Trent* also, where such prevalent Heresies and Schismes were condemned and removed, Subscriptions were used; and in those five of *Lateran*, those two of *Lions*, and that of *Vienna*, they were not used, nor in the first Council neither, for the said Reasons. Now what a vast falsity of consequence would this be? Those latter Generall Councils (which is halfe the Councils in number) have no Subscriptions annexed to them in the Tomes of Councils: *Ergo*, none of those Councils consented to the Decrees, or Canons, which are universally received as made by them, ever since.

Thirdly, The very Canons themselves of this Council never appeared in any Tomes of Councils, till three hundred years after it was held; no not in some Tomes of Councils, which after three hundred years, (as those of James Merlin, Anno 1530. at Colen;) which put in the Canons of ancienter and of later Councils, as those of Constance and Basil; but no Canons of the Fourth Lateran Council under Innocent the Third. And when they were produced as the Canons of that Council, (and not as the Decretals of the Popes onely, which might perhaps have been read and offered to the Council, yet not approved nor consented to by the Council) they were produced first, not out of the Vatican, or other publique Records, but out of a private ancient Book. That the Popes and Canonists for three hundred years space should let those Canons (if they had been confirmed by that Council, which they called General) lie unpublished, and uninserted into the Tomes of their Councils, is to common sense incredible.

This is a strange kinde of fallacy: how could those Canons be put into the Tomes  
of

of Councils, till three hundred years after that Council, when there were no such Tomes set out since that Councell, till three hundred years after it; unless you would have those Canons inserted into the Tomes of Councils, before any such Tomes were extant, wherein they could be put. For those of *Binius* were published *Anno* 1606. and those of *Merlin* (as you confess) 1530. which was above three hundred years after the *Lateran* Councell; that having been celebrated *Anno* 1215. Now (as *Gesner* and *Simler* witness in their *Epitome Bibliothecæ*) *Merlin* added many Canons and Councils to the collection of *Isidore Junior*, who flourished about the year 600. which argues, that there were no Tomes of Councils set forth betwixt those of *Isidore* and those of *Merlin*: for had there been any, they should not have said, that he added Canons and Councils to those of *Isidore* so long before him, but to those Tomes and Councils, which had been published the next before him. So that there was no other Collection of Councils published, since the Council of *Lateran*, till three hundred years and more after

after it. It is therefore (quite contrary to what you here say) not onely incredible, but impossible, that those Canons should have been published in the Tomes of Councils, till three hundred years after the *Lateran* Council.

But you tell us, that *Merlin* hath not inserted those Canons into his Tomes: which if it be so, it is no great wonder; for (as *Gesner* witnesseth) he collected all the Councils into one Volume; and it had been very difficult to have put all the Acts and Canons of every Council before his time into one volume, seeing now 4, 6, nay 30. Volumes and more, are filled with the Acts and Canons of Councils. But if this Author have neither inserted these Canons, nor directed his Reader where he may finde them, he ha's made a very imperfect Collection of Councils: for *Coriolanus* in his *Sum* in the *Proemium* to this Council, affirms, That *Gregory* the Ninth, who flourished in the Year 1227. onely twelve years after this Council, ha's inserted them all into his Collection of Decretals; and *Binius* cites in the Margin to every one of them (save two) in what Title and Chapter

ter they are to be found. And as it is the ordinary custome in the Books of the Decretals, to cite every sentence, whence it is taken, whether from some Council, Pope, or Father, it cannot be but these are cited as taken from the Canons of that *Lateran* Council, as we have proved *St. Thomas*, *Scotus*, and all other Schoolmen have cited them ever since that Council; and as the Canons are cited in 6°. from the Councell of *Lions* and other Councils.

Then you argue thus. Those Tomes of Councils cite the said Canons from some old Book, and not out of the *Vatican*; *Ergo*, they were not consented to by the Council. Cites not *Binius* the Canons of the Third Council of *Lateran*, out of an old Book, and not from the *Vatican*? Have we not the Canons of the first Council of *Lions* from an old Book of *Matthew Paris*, (whom you cite as a credible Authour) and not from the *Vatican*? Are there not in our age hundreds of Ancient Authors brought to light out of old Books, and not from the *Vatican*? to which both you and we give credit. What monsters of consequences then be these



these of yours? But how prove you, that the Collectors of Councils took these Canons out of an old Book? you say it is so; and it seems, you would have all men to think, that your bare affirmation is proof enough; for you bring here no other. Yet we hope it will be but just in us, to bring more. For beside the non-probation of it, it seems to us possible, nay not wholly unlikely, that the Canons, which were taken out of an old Book, as *Binius* affirms, were the Canons of the Third Council of *Lateran*, and not those of the Fourth under *Innocentius* the third. For what need had those Collectors to be beholding to an old Book to finde them, when they were so publicly inserted into the Canon Law, and recorded by Saint *Anthony* and others, in their Histories, as the genuine Canons of the Fourth *Lateran* Council. Thus you take one Council, for another.

P. 39.

*Our fourth Reason is plain Affirmations, That they came not to agreement of any such material Decrees as these 70. or 60. Chapters; Johannes Nauclerus Tubingensis ad Annum 1215. Innocentius Papa Romæ*

Romæ in Ecclesia Lateranensi Concilium, sive Synodum, celebravit: (*He calls it not Universal, or General, as Matthew Paris did, when he says the Patriarchs of Jerusalem and Constantinople were there*) Venere multa tum quidem in consultationem, nec decerni tamen quicquam aperte potuit, quod & Pisani & Genevenses maritimo, Cisalpini terrestri bello inter se certabant. Editæ tamen nonnullæ Constitutiones referuntur; è quibus una existit, &c.) *which one then reported is none of these 70. Canons*) Multa denique pro recuperatione Terræ Sanctæ tractata fuisse, &c. Multa denique, &c. *not multa tamen, &c. So that the abovesaid Venere multa quidem in consultationem, nec decerni tamen quicquam aperte potuit, were other many things also besides those last of the recovery of the Holy Land; which other things by reason of the Popes necessity of hastening to the composing of the Wars broken out 'twixt the Pisani and Genuenses, &c. could not receive such mature discussion, as might bring them to be Conciliarily defined by those, to one part whereof they seemed burthensome to impose, and to the other but placabilia.*

## C. 40.

But your fourth Argument sure will make amends for all, and repair what you have lost in the three first. *Veneremur multa quidem in consultationem, nec decerni tamen quicquam apertè potuit.* Many things came then into consultation, and yet nothing could be openly decreed. These words we confess, are much to your purpose. For seeing whatsoever is decreed in a generall Council, must be *openly* and publicly decreed, that being the Representative of the whole Church, and the most publique and high Tribunall among Christians; if nothing could be *openly* decreed in that Council, it seems evident, that absolutely nothing at all was decreed in it; and so, (which is your inference) that *the Council consented not to these Canons*: and here you see plainly, that we cannot escape you. Yet one thing you will, we hope, please to permit us, to plead for our selves, that (under favour) you cite *Naucerus* words otherwise then they are in the Authour: you make him say *apertè, openly*, when he sayes *apertè, fitly, or conveniently*; and so by adding a syllable to the Authors word, make

make it a quite other word; and by that you change the whole sense and meaning of the Authour. For he sayes onely this, that by reason of the wars in *Italy*, and beyond the *Alpes*, nothing could *fitly*, or with *convenience* be decerned, (that is, with all those ceremonies, examinations, and length of deliberation, by reason that they were to hasten, for the composition of those differences: (not that they could not receive such mature discussion, as might bring them to be conciliarily defined, (as you say here, and we have demonstrated the contrary) but that both more Definitions might have been made, and matters determined, and those which were made, more fully and compleatly digested, then by reason of want of time (for what this Authour sayes) they were or could be. And yet some Constitutions are related to have been made in it, though not with that *Convenience*, which might have been wished: and you make him say, that nothing could be there *openly*, that is *absolutely* concluded: and so those Constitutions, which are related of that Council, were not decreed in it, but false and sup-  
posi-

356. *Of the Authority of the*  
posititious. We leave this your dealing to  
the censure of the Auditory.

P. 40.

*Of the same Councell* \* God-  
frey, a Monk of the same time  
wrote in his *Annals* ad Annum  
1215. *Nihil dignum memoriae,*  
quod commendari possit, ibi actum est;  
nisi quod Orientals Ecclesia (quod antea  
inauditum fuit) se subditam Romanæ Ec-  
clesiæ exhibuit, &c. (*As that Monk*  
*judged those few Greek Bishops comming to*  
*that Councell, called by the Pope to be a sub-*  
*jection to him; but which had been not*  
*heard of before, saith he.*)

\* Gotte-  
fredus  
Viterbi-  
ensis.

You cite next *Godfrey* the Monk; and  
that we might know what *Godfrey* you  
mean, you put in the Margine *Gothefredus*  
*Viterbienses*. Now this note might well  
have been spared; for *Gothefredus Viter-*  
*biensis* was no Monk, but a Secular Priest,  
and publique Notary to the Emperour  
*Conradus* the Third, and *Frederick* the  
First, as *Bellarmino* witnesses, and conti-  
nued not his History to the Year 1215.  
as you say this Monk did, but onely till  
about the Year 1187. in the time of *Ur-*  
*bannus* the Third, to whom he dedicated  
his

his Book. Yet we acknowledge there was a later Author called *Godfrey* the Monk, but as it ſeems a very obſcure one: for neither *Gefner*, nor *Simlerus* your owne Authors, nor *Gualterus*, nor *Bellarmino* take notice of him. This *Godfrey* therefore ad Annum 1215. ſayes thus. *Eodem anno Papa Romæ Concilium habuit, ubi tam de tranſmarinis partibus, quàm de cunctis Chriſtianorum finibus, Patriarchis, Archiepiſcopis, Episcopis, Abbatibus, Prælatiſ Eccleſiarum congregatiſ in Eccleſiâ Sancti Johannis Baptiſtæ, Concilium in feſto Sancti Martini inchoatum, & uſque ad feſtum Sancti Andreæ protrahum: nihil dignum memoria, quod commendari poſſit, ibi actum eſt: niſi quòd Orientaliſ Eccleſia (quod antea inauditum) ſe ſubditam Romane Eccleſiæ exhibuit. Nam Conſtantinopoli duo in Patriarcham electi Romam venerunt; .... qui ambos concilio Cardinalium depoſuit, & tertium ſubſtituit, & inveſtivit.* “In the ſame Year the  
 “Pope had a Council at Rome, where as  
 “well from the parts beyond ſea, as from  
 “all the parts of Chriſtendom, the Pa-  
 “triarchs, Archbiſhops, Biſhops Abbats,  
 “Prelates of the Churches, &c. being  
 aſſem-

“ assembled, the Council was begun in  
“ the Church of St. *John Baptist*, on the  
“ Feast of St. *Martin*, and continued till  
“ the Feast of St. *Andrew*. There was  
“ no worthy thing done there, which can  
“ be commended to memory; save that  
“ the East Church (which had not been  
“ heard of before) made it self subject to  
“ the Roman. For there came two, who  
“ were chosen at *Constantinople* to be Pa-  
“ triarchs (of that city,) who, (the Pope)  
“ with the Council of his Cardinals de-  
“ posed them both, and substituted & in-  
“ vested a third. Now draw your position  
from these words, viz, *That the Lateran*  
*Council consented not to those Canons*. There  
was no worthy thing done there, which  
can be commended to memory, save the  
subjection of the Eastern Church to the  
Romane: *Ergo* the Council consented  
not to those 70. Canons; how prove you  
this consequence? Because, will you say,  
if they had consented to those Canons,  
there had been done there some worthy  
thing, which could be commended to me-  
mory. We answer, that this Authour  
speaks not of such things as were *decreed*  
in this Councell; and were so authenti-  
cally



cally inserted into the publique Records of the Church, the Books of Decretals, or Canon law, that they needed not the testimony of any particular Historian to preserve the memory of them; but of other accidentary matters, and matters of Fact, as were acted in that Assembly, whether in or out of the Sessions of that Councell; which being not so authentically testified, required the Records of Historians to preserve them in memory. This appears by the example which he giveth of substituting a new Patriarch of *Constantinople*, not by the Authority, or in the Sessions of this Councell, but by the Authority of the Bishop of *Rome*, and the Councell of his Cardinals. *Qui ambos Concilio Cardinalium deposuit, & tertium substituit & investivit.* Which must have been done before the Authentick sitting of the Councell; for otherwise there had been no determinate Patriarch of *Constantinople* in it; which all Historians agree there was. And secondly, this subjection to the Roman Bishop was, not onely in the judgement of the Authour, (as you would perswade your Reader) but reall and effectuell. For what greater evidence  
of

of Authority and supream Jurisdiction over any Church can there be, then to depose their Patriarchs, and substitute others in their places? And yet thirdly, this was no usurpation, or assumption of an Authority not belonging to the Bishops of *Rome*. For that Patriarch so substituted by *Innocentius* was accepted as the Patriarch of *Constantinople* by the whole Synod, as appears by his sitting according to the dignity of his place in that Councell; what this Authour addes concerning this subjection of the Eastern Church (*quod ante à inauditum*) may have this morall sense, that to subject themselves *so far* to the Pope, as to the deposition and creation of their Patriarchs, unless it had been in case of Heresie, Usurpation, or Intrusion, was *ante à inauditum*, an unheard of thing, and so extraordinary, that it must have been done by reason of some very urgent necessity, and for the generall peace and good of the Church. For otherwise it was the ordinary custome of the Eastern Churches (as appears in the Councell of *Florence*) to constitute their Patriarchs within themselves, and onely to require the *Pall*, and Confirmation



Confirmation of them from the Bishop of Rome. What other subjection the Eastern Church alwayes had to the Roman Bishop shall be treated more fully in another place. And though this Authour say that such a kinde of subjection was then *res inaudita*, an unheard of thing, yet he approves of it, as being *res digna*, a worthy thing, and deserving to be committed to memory, as appears by his words cited by you. *Nihil dignum, &c. nisi quod Orientalis, &c.*

P. 41.

Fifthly, among the Pretended Canons of that Council, beside that which we shall object more weighty anon, against the third and fourtieth third Canons, as favouring of Heresie. In the fiftieth Canon let any that know the reverence due to the gravity of the Decrees of generall Councils, in this, doubt of these Canons, estimate, whether these following words have any thing like, or worthy the gravity of a generall Council, or of that Council (part of the 50<sup>th</sup>. Canon.) The number of four, saith the Canon, doth well agree to the prohibition of corporall marriage, (viz, that such prohibition exceed not the fourth degree of

R

con-

*consanguinity and affinity.*) Of which corporall marriage the Apostle saith, The man hath not power over his own body, but the woman, &c. And why forbid to four degrees of kindred? Quia quatuor sunt humores in corpore, quod constat ex quatuor Elementis, &c. Because, saith the pretended Canon, the Humours in the Body are four, which consisteth of four Elements.

## C. 42.

You cite the Canon lamely and untruly. It is this. *Prohibitio quoque copulae conjugalis quartam consanguinitatis & affinitatis gradum de cætero non excedat, quia in ulterioribus gradibus jam non potest sine gravi dispendio hujusmodi prohibitio generaliter observari.* The prohibition of Conjugal conjunction shall not hereafter exceed the fourth degree; (this is the substance of the Prohibition :) Because this Prohibition cannot now be observed without great harm in more remote degrees. This is the reason given by the Councell of the prohibition. Then follows *Quaternarius enim numerus bene convenit prohibitioni conjugii corporalis; (de quo dicit Apostolus, quod vir non habet potestatem sui corporis, sed mulier*

*mulier ; neque mulier habet potestatem sui corporis, sed vir) quia quatuor sunt humores in corpore, quod constat ex quatuor Elementis. For the number of four agrees well with the prohibition of corporall Marriage (of which the Apostle saith, That the Husband hath not power of his body, but the wife ; and the Wife hath not power of her body, but the Husband.) Because there are four humours in the body, which is composed of the four Elements. Whereby it clearly appears, that the Councell gives not this reason of restraining the prohibition of Marriage to four degrees onely: for that was delivered by the Councell in the former words to be the impossibility (morally speaking) to observe the ancient precept of the Church in more then four. But onely affirms, that the number of four agrees well with the prohibition of the corporall conjunction of Marriage ; because the body is affected with four humours, and consists of four Elements : which is no reason, but an allusion to a number found in both, very familiar in ancient Authours. You therefore impose very injuriously and untruly upon the Councell, when you say, And why for-*

*bid to four degrees? Quia quatuor sunt humores in corpore, quod constat ex quatuor Elementis.* For in these words you would perswade your Reader, that the Councell gives the four humours, and four Elements of the body, for the *immediate and sole* reason of this restraint, to four degrees onely: then which nothing can be more untrue.

P. 42.

*Sixthly and lastly, in default of any subscriptions at the end of that Councel, and of any Acclamations at the end, the Historia minor of Matthew Paris gives this end, this issue to that Councel. Concilium illud generale quod, more Papali, grandia primâ fronte præ se tulit, in risum & Scomma, quo Archiepiscopos, Episcopos, Abbates, Diaconos, & Archidiaconos, omnesque ad Concilium accedentes, artificiose ludificatus est, desit. Illi enim, cum jam nihil geri in tanto negotio cernerent, redeundi ad sua cupidi veniam sigillatim petierunt; quibus Papa non concessit, antequàm sibi grandem pecuniam promississent, quam a mercatoribus Romanis prius accipere mutuo, Papaque solvere*

*Antiquit.  
Britannicæ  
in vita  
Stephani  
Langton.*

solvere coacti sunt, antequàm discedere Româ potuissent. Papa jam acceptâ pecuniâ quæstuosum hoc Concilium dissolvit gratis, totusque clerus abiit tristis. I omit the Englishing of this and other Testimonies, for brevities sake; which I may English hereafter. This the issue to confirm our opinion of that Council, instead of subscriptions to confirm those Lateran Canons: which devised (probably) by Innocentius the third, and confirmed by his Nephew Gregory the ninth, yet were neither made nor confirmed by that Council of Lateran, what ever that were.

C. 43.

It is no marvell that you cite texts (pretended by you to be of ancient Authors) favourable to your cause, when you cite them, onely as you finde their words alleadged, in our professed enemies, who will be sure to make them as disadvantageous to us as they. These *Antiquitates Britannica*, were fet out by Matthew Parker after the year 1560, even in their first Edition, which have no farther credit with us, then as far as they agree with the authentickall words of the Authour himself, Matthew Paris; and



therefore the words should have bin cited out of *Paris* himself, to have had any force against us, or deserved any answer from us; and this *Historia Minor* of his should have been otherwise squared out to us, where it might be found, then as it is, by lame pieces, here and there quoted in those Antiquitates, set out by Authority of *Matthew Parker*, which is rendered very dubious, nay supposititious to us, by so many strange expressions, against religious Orders and others, and here against Pope *Innocentius*, so far different from what *Matthew Paris* sayes, in his *Historia major*: produce therefore this *Historia minor* it self; and then require an Answer. Yet whatsoever is, or is not of the Authority of these words, they make nothing at all to your purpose, unless you first prove, that the *tantum negotium*, that great affair, whereof these words treat, be the definition of those sixty, (or seventy) Canons: which neither these words say, nor can ever be legitimately deduced from them; and it is much more probable, that the *tantum negotium*, whereof they speak, was the expedition to recover the holy Land, then  
the

the definition of the Canons, for great Sums of money might be prudently pretended for that, but none at all for the definition, without manifest Simony, and Sacriledge.

C. 44.

¶ 4. Arguments against the new accepti-  
on of the word Church.

Secondly, you render your own Proposition dubious and equivocall, without any light given to understand the different accepti-  
on of the word Church in it, and so not intelligible; which is this, That he, who separates others unjustly from the Church Communion, doth thereby consequentially separate himself from the Church. For in the former part of this Proposition, Church is clearly taken for the visible Church; and in the latter you take it for the invisible, that is, for the lively members of Christ.

P. 44.

Thus farre having spoken to that Paragraph in particular, and in generall to your dispersed mention of this Hatred and Con-

R 4

tempt

tempt of *Catholique Communion*, we now proceed to speak to every of the rest of Objections, which you make to us throughout all your Papers. To what you object pag. 11 against that our Proposition, That he, who separates others unjustly from the Church Communion, doth thereby consequentially separate himself from the Church, in another important acception of the word Church, that it was rendred dubious and equivocall, without any light given to understand, &c. Could men speak more plain then we did? viz. pag. 28. in our Papers, That the unjust separatour of others doth separate himself, in some important sense, from the Body of Christ; viz. (said we) he becomes a dead member, and so an equivocal, and so no member of Christ's Body, h. e. of the Church, in some proper acception of the word Church: which acception we there immediately interpreted, viz. St. Pauls acception, 1 Cor. 6. where he saith, That no member of an Harlot can be at the same time a member of Christ; and so not of his Body mysticall: yet we added, that he committing that sin secretly, might remain a member of the Church, as the Church consisted of Bishops, Pastors, and

People:

People: (h. e. as it is an organical political Body) for he said expressly, that such might remain a Bishop, or Pastour, in the visible Church; and they become schismaticall, who refuse to communicate with him. Lastly, for perspicuities sake we added, pag. 40. To conclude this Reply with our true sense in this case, which you, by your Arguments, said, we seem not willing to understand; He which separates others unjustly from the Communion of the whole Church, separateth himself (to there our Proposition) both from the external Communion of those, whom he so separates, and from the internall Communion of those whom he separates not; and makes himself further liable to be separated (by the just Sentence of his Superiours) even from the externall Communion of those also, whom he doth pretend at all to separate. These are our words there. Yet, according to your rule, when nothing can be objected to our words, how clear and distinct soever we labour to be; yet you must tell your Auditors something, either that our Propositions are dubious and equivocal, and so not intelligible, pag. 11. or that we discourse very intricately, pag. 14. or perhaps

*now (when we labour to avoid such pretensions again to be objected to us) that we are long, while we labour to be clear and distinct in every point.*

C. 45.

What strange kinde of answering is this? We object the dubiousnesse and equivocation of your words, as they stood in the Reply, before you had used any of these Explications, which you mention here, and you answer us, that you explicated those words clear enough afterwards: which in effect comes to thus much; That a proposition in any Author, or Text in holy Scripture, is not obscure before it be explicated, because it is made clear after it be explicated. Sure you were put to fore straits, when you were driven upon such poor shifts as these. We shew, that if your Explications here mentioned be true, your former Proposition, taken solely in it self without and before them, is rendred dubious by reason of those very Explications of it; and you say, that you gave those explications of it, which we acknowledge you did, and thence argue, that those Expositions of the word *Church*, if they be admitted as true,

true, make your Proposition dubious, as it was first nakedly delivered by you; there having then been given neither explication nor light, whereby it could be collected, that you took the word Church otherwise in the latter part of your Proposition, viz. *We grant also, that he, who separates another unjustly from the Church Communion, doth thereby consequentially separate himself from the Church.* You took, we say, the word Church otherwise in the latter part then you did in the former.

## P. 45.

*As to your whole mistake about the Church visible and invisible, we did last reading, thoughtly and sufficiently rectifie your mistake, that we made no such distinction; but another most true and necessary: yet since the Reader of your Papers will not seldom again meet with this in you as a reserve, wherewith to turn off our Arguments and Answers unspoken to, &c.*

## C. 46.

*Either you made such a distinction, or you delivered a clear contradiction, when you said, That a Bishop separating another by unjust Excommunication remains still a true*

true Bishop (and consequently a true member) of the visible Church. Now if he remains a true Bishop, and member of the visible Church, and yet is consequentially separated himself from the Church, in that acception wherein you take the word Church, then certainly by the word Church you cannot understand the visible Church; and so must consequently understand the invisible; unless you would make that Bishop at the same time both a true member, and no true member of the visible Church. Now this was our Argument, which because it was unanswerable, you handsomely conceal it, without giving the least word of reply to it. Discourse therefore as much as you please, what your meaning is by the word Church in your new acception; and that you take it not for the invisible Church, so long as our Argument stands, as it hitherto ha's done, unanswered by you, all the world will see, that you must either have understood by it the invisible Church, to avoid the foresaid contradiction; or held, that there is a Church, which is neither visible nor invisible; which would be a strange Paradox. For  
you



you say not that such a Bishop is a member of some part, or acception of the visible Church, but that he is a member of the *visible Church*; that is, as visible Church is taken properly in its whole latitude, as contradistinct from the invisible.

P. 46  
So page 21. We omit, *say you*, our Answer of spirituall murther, &c. (that is, a whole side and a half of clear instances against you) as being grounded upon your new spirituall acception of the word Church; which is already refuted, *say you*, and for the same reason we omit your Answer to the fourth and last of internal and external separation, as depending upon the same confused ground. An excellent way of answering! Can any blame us now for taking away that vision, for shewing at large that to be your own clear mistake? For making good our (not your) phansied distinction of the word Church? So as you never have, nor any can be able to gain-say, that believes either Scriptures, or Fathers, who so frequently say, that he who loves not, is not (in some acception of the word Church) of the Catholicque

thetique Church. Yet once more in the behalf, not of our selves, or for the justifying of our proposition against you, (for that is done abundantly already) but of all the Protestants of the Church of England, we here offer to maintain, that the visibility of the Church of Christ is more destroyed from some of the Romish Principles, then from any part, or particle of the doctrine of the Church of England; (and yet that is that with which your men, and now you, are ever upbraiding us with :) which of us come nearest the making the Church invisible, let any judge. You profess to agree with us, and me with you, that true Baptism, (whereof water is an essentiall, externall, visible part) being externally received, makes visible Christians, and a visible Church. That the true visible Church is a society of persons Believers, and baptized, else not a visible Church. Hitherto we agree, you superadde, that the intention of the Priest, or of him that administers Baptism, is necessary to make it true Baptism; which intention of the Priest is most certainly invisible, if it were certainly known by us; but must needs be also uncertain to men, who know not the hearts: and so you  
make

make the visibility of the whole Church to depend essentially on that, which is altogether invisible and uncertain: and that it is no more certain, (by any thing visible) that there is a visible Church, then that is certain, which can never be seen, nor certainly known. Again, that the visible Church is a society of Pastors rightly ordained, and their Flocks adhering to them, &c. is a truth wherein we both agree: you superadde, that the intention of the Prelate is essentially necessary to the validity of the ordination (so far as ever we could learn your doctrine:) if this doctrine you will acknowledge now it presseth you, then you make all the truth of Ordination, and so Pastors, and consequently of the visible Church, to depend upon that which is invisible and uncertain, viz. the intention of the Prelates Ordainers.

## C. 47.

You here passe over from pag. 11. to pag. 21. a large reach, and thereby leave unanswered and unexpressed many of our Difficulties, and then blame us, for expressing, that we omit a fide and a half of yours; but, we intreat you first to answer that our now mentioned Argument,  
drawn

drawn from your words, and then we give you freedom to say, that we were mistaken; and that we had no solid reason to omit those your instances, as founded upon a false ground: which though they had filled not onely a whole side and a half, but many sheets of paper, they could require no other answer, then the overthrowing the ground of them; which any judicious Reader will see we have done, till our Argument be answered.

P. 47.

*Thus have ye left neither certainty of visible baptized people, nor certainty of visible rightly ordained Pastors; and then surely no certainty of the visible Church; that there may be sure to be dependance upon the very intentions of your Prelates and Priests. Others, who received their Ordination from your Church, who knew, that neither the secret wickednesse, nor other secret intention, or not-intention of the Prelates, but onely a visible professed intention, is sufficient to the validity of Ordination, may be more certain of their right Ordination (and so of their visible Church) then you, from whom perhaps they received it, can be.*

*Argument. benediction was the last*  
*now*

C. 48.

C. 48.

All this is an unnecessary digression, and pure *paregon*; for we never denied, that the word *Church* had its different acceptions, both in the Scriptures and holy Fathers: but we contended, that as *Church* is treated in the matter of Schism, which we have now in hand, it is onely to be taken for the *visible Church*, consisting of lawfull Pastors and People, subject the one to the other, and united all together in one Politique Body. Your Arguments drawn from the intention in Baptism and holy Orders evince no more the invisibility of the Church, or uncertainty of her visibility, then does the intention necessary to valid Marriage in the persons contracting, evince the invisibility, or uncertainty of lawfull Children, Inheritours of Estates, Heirs of Kingdoms, &c. in Christian Commonwealths. And the reason, why neither of them evinces, is, because, that both when persons of repute and credit pronounce all the words, and performe all other external Ceremonies required visibly in the celebration of Marriage, they are, with a morall certainty, to be supposed to yield their internall consent,

consent, when no ground at all is given to suspect, that they gave it not. And when persons of the like repute, celebrate externally Baptisme, or Orders, they are to be supposed to have had a true intention, which they themselves held to be as necessary to the validity of those Sacraments, as is the intention of contracting, in that of Marriage; when there appears no occasion of suspecting they had it not. Either therefore you must take away all visibility and certainty of lawfull Christian Commonwealths, Kingdoms, Inheritances, &c. or confesse, that your Argument concludes nothing against the visibility and certainty of a visible Church, in the grounds of the Roman Religion. It imports therefore little, whether you in yours, or those of the Roman Church in their Tenet, be *more certain* of their visible Pastours, &c. for if they have a sufficient certainty, which excludes all prudent doubt, or suspicion of the contrary, they need no more to induce them, as a motive of Credibility, to believe the visible Church, &c.

P. 48.

*If here you Reply, [you may be certain,*  
for

for that God hath promised, there shall ever be a visible Church;] we answer, that he hath no where promised, that the Roman Church shall ever remaine that visible Church, or a true visible part of that true visible Church: but hath expressly warned them, that they should not be high-minded, but fear, lest he spare it not: Goodnesse towards her, if she continue in his goodnesse; otherwise, that she also shall be cut off, Rom. 11. 20, 21, 22. Whereas on the other side he hath made that promise to them that believe him, that all who visibly receive the holy Sacraments, Baptisme, Eucharist, and have Pastors visibly rightly ordained, and visibly professe the true Faith, Holinesse, and Communion of the Saints (whatever be their Baptizers, or Ordainers secret Intentions) may be certain, (which you cannot be) that they are a true visible Church of Christ. Now name that Doctrine of ours, that thus obscures the Churches visibility.

## C. 49.

Here is a wider digression, then the former; (and yet you are the onely men, who avoid all digressions, and do your utmost to bring the question to a speedy issue,



issue: how often have you professed this?) must we leave now all we have in hand, to prove that the Roman Church is, and ever was the true Catholique visible Church? Where are the *Volumes needful*, (whereof you talk in your letters) if they be not here? To omit therefore so large a digression (for the present) we answer, that whatsoever is, or is not of the Roman Churches, being the visible true Church, or at least a true part of it, &c. To answer your Argument it is sufficient, to tell you, that not onely the Roman, and those who are united to her, but the Eastern Church also, and those of her union, and so all Churches visible or pretending to be so before your innovation, held, that the intention of the Baptizer, Priest, and Bishop, was necessary to the validity of the Sacraments; *that* having been defined in the Council of *Florence*, both by those of the Eastern and Western Churches: and we would gladly know, whether those of the Eastern Church have revoked, and contradicted that definition, ever since that time, from approved *Classique* Authours. Either therefore shew that *true intention* was not thus

thus required by some visible Churches before your time, or acknowledge, that in rejecting the necessity of it, you contradict all the visible Churches in the world, which were before Protestants begun to be visible.

P. 32. *Num.* 2. That which you say to our second Argument of the unvoluntariness of the consequent Separation of ones self from the Church by unjust Separation of others, &c. cannot be said in your new opinion, of understanding that Separation of ones self from the company of the lively members of Christ onely; for I have shewed, that whosoever commits such an unjust act, separates himself as voluntarily from them, as he does from the Head, Christ our Saviour, whose body that invisible number of lively members are, as you acknowledge.

*Ibidem.* To what you object of voluntary *in causâ*, in an unjust excommunication, is grounded either in a false writing of our Text, or in some inadvertency in the reading of it. For our Text ha's it *justly*, not *unjustly*: and we hope our solemn words may be taken, that we made no change in the writing, since it was written out.

P. 49.

Next there Pag. 11. you endeavour to make that proposition of ours to be false. For say you, he that separates others unjustly, separates not himself from the Body and lively members of Christ consequentially, but formally and primarily. For that injustice separates from the number of the just formally and primarily, but not consequentially, as we have said. We answer, you erre greatly to think, that to be a lively members of Christ superaddes nothing at all, but is the same formally and wholly with being of the number of the just: whereas these are not formally and wholly, or purely the same, as such: for then could they never be separated: but just persons, as such, might have been just persons, and have been just persons, that were not *vi formalis rationis justitiæ*, as such, the members of Christs Body. v. gr. Our first parents in the state of Innocency, whiles they stood in it, were of the number of the just. All mankinde might have been, and might have continued just persons, and might not have been yet for all that members of Christs body: which supposes Christs incarnation. So that

as

as Adoption of Sons in the Son of God made the Son of man, that we might become the Sons of God, so also Communion with, and becoming members of Christs live mysticall Body, to be members of his Body, of his Flesh, and of his Bones, (as St. Paul saith Believers are, Eph. 5.) is a distinct benefit, and honour, and privilege, promised and given by Christ to all, who turn from unjustice by repentance to Righteousnesse of God, and believe on the blood of Jesus, and are by one Spirit baptized into that one Body, (1 Corinthians 12. 13.) So then you corrected that, which you seemed not enough to have understood in us, when you blame us for saying, That the unjust Excommunicatour separates himself consequentially from Christs Body, whereas you would needs have it to be formally the same to be just, and a member of Christs Body, of his Flesh, and of his Bone; and to be unjust, the same formally with cutting himself off from that privilege, honour and benefit; which we prove to be distinct, though now necessarily alwayes consequent.

## C. 50.

This whole Paragraph might have been well spared; for who sees not, that we treat (as Christians use to do) of Justice, *in statu lapsus*, after the fall of our first Parents, restored to us by our Saviour? As therefore every mortall sin, committed in this present state, destroyes and excludes the Justice, or Grace of Christ, formally and essentially; and so formally excludes, or separates those, who commit it, from the number of those who are just by the Justice of Christ; so unjust excommunication of others from the visible Church of Christ, (for of that still we dispute) being a mortall sin, must formally, and not consequentially (as you say) separate from the number of the just, that is, the lively members of Christ. Now to shew the weakness of this your far fetcht invention, even from *Adam* and *Eve's* innocency; we desire to know, whether mortall sin destroyes formally the Grace and Justice of Christ in a soul immediately before justified, or no: if you say, it destroyes it not; we then demand, what destroyes it formally; if sin do not; or why it is called *Light*, and mortall

mortall sin *darkness*; why it, *Justice*, and mortall sin, iniquity, &c. If they be not formally opposed one to the other. If you say, it destroyes it formally, then your argute Argument is solved: and our exception against you confirmed.

Neither is the term of *lively members of Christ*, (now attributed to all the just) a consequential, but a precedential, or causall predicate to justice, or the just; or at least a formall effect of Justice in this state. For therefore are the just said now, to be *lively members of Christ*, either because they are justified in Christ, that is, by his sole merits, as the meritorious cause of their being just, or because supernatural justice, formally makes them, children, servants, and living members, united to Christ as parts of his mysticall body to their head, both which senses are destructive of your position. And as our first Parents in the state of Innocency, could not be said consequentially live members of God, but either causally, they being made just by the free goodness and charity of God, or because original justice made them formally the children and friends of God; so that just

S

now

now, cannot be said, to be consequential-ly, but either causally, or formally, the live members of Christ. If you should reply, That if rendering one a lively member of Christ be the formall effect of justice, then all justice must have that effect; for the formal effect of every thing is common to the whole species, which is not true here, for original justice in the state of innocency had not that effect: we answer, all justice must have that effect, *Quantum est ex se*, or *per se loquendo*, or conditionally so much as belongs to justice, having a power to effect it, &c. we grant it; all justice must have that effect actually, and compleatly, and absolutely we deny it. So that all true supernatural justice hath for its formal effect, to render the just a friend or live member of God; if God be not incarnate, it hath only a power to make one a friend of God incarnate conditionally, that is, supposing that he were incarnate, it would make him his friend, if he be incarnate actually, justice makes the just absolutely, or compleatly the friend of God incarnate, that is, a lively member of Christ. As whiteness hath onely a conditionall power to  
make



make a wall white, supposing there be no actual wall wherein to put it; but if it be put actually into a wall, it makes it formally, absolutely, and compleatly white.

P. 50.

*But this error of yours hath perhaps its spring from another, then which yet it is worse, viz. that Justification is nothing else in its formal reason, but inherent righteousness; or being of the number of inherently just persons. Thus you fight against us out of Principles not common to us both, nor true; and protract the dispute by many little cavils, not at all pertinent to the main question; but glad it seems you would be to refute some passage of ours or other, that falls from us occasionally.*

C. 51.

Here is a third Digression about inherent Justice, of the same extent with the former (for you must needs remove all that you think we will say, whether we say it or no; and so you may make work for volumes enough, and bid the question in hand adieu: ) but we must cut you short, and labour to keep you near to the mark, by telling you, that in whatsoever you or we constitute justify-

S 2

ing

ing Grace, or divine Justice, still the just are truly just, and all mortall sins are truly unjust, in what state or manner soever they are considered: and so all mortall sin, such as Schisme, whereof we speak, is, must be formally opposite, and destructive of all justifying Grace; and thereby formally separating those, who are guilty of it, from the number of all just persons: and if of all, then from the number of the lively members of Christ; who are as truly just (though not so perfectly) as were our first Parents in time of their Innocency.

P. 51.

*Your fourth Objection therefore there, is like the rest, though we had told you expressly our sense of our own words, yet you tell us that cannot be our sense of that passage, and but a passage obiter, not at all importing to the question for (whether the unjust Excommunicatour did, or did not separate himself also) our question, our definition, our Arguments accused him of Schisme for separating others: which is neither more nor less true nor false, whether that passage be true or false. But you have tried your strength against that poor passage, and have*

con-

confirmed it to us, rather then weakened it. And this again we advert, (that we may leave this once more for all in the Auditors due Observation) you are the cause of the digressions, which swell the Controversie.

## C. 52.

After you have made these three needlesse digressions, you fall sore upon us to remove the blame from your selves. The passage about which we controvert, was of main importance to the question which we treat, of the nature of Schisme. For if every one, who separates another unjustly, separates consequentially himself from the visible Hierarchical Church, (for so we understood it, when we first excepted against it, and have proved since, that it could not be understood otherwise) then what you said, and have endeavoured to prove all this while, viz. *That there is some Separation from the visible Church, beside that of ones self, (or as you say at other times, which is not a separation of ones self) which is truly Schisme, will be overthrown: seeing every unjust Separation of others from the visible Church, will at least consequentially be a Separation of ones self from the visible Church.* Whe-

ther this therefore, as your proposition was first understood by us, was a needless digression, made, (as you seem more then once to accuse us ) to avoid the direct question in hand, and prolong unnecessarily the dispute; we remit to all equall judgements. But the truth is, you have found your selves not a little straitened in the defence of it, and therefore shew your selves so unwilling to have it sifted: and that this might not appear, you use all your endeavours to perswade your Readers, that it was a needless digression, and so not of concern whether you make it good or no.

P. 52.

*Well: but why must that be our sense, which we say was not our sense? Because else our discourse would be inconsequent: for that we fall upon the proposition by treating a Saying of yours. Here you enforce us, (as if it were your delight) that the consequence and occasion of one line spoken must this twentieth time be repeated from the beginning. The consequence therefore and contexture of our discourse, and yours was this: (for we shrink not an inch from it.) A little before that passage we pressed*

pressed you to give us but a punctual Answer to our main Question and Argument, which was this, Was that Act of Diotrepbes, viz. his unjust casting out of the Church the Brethren, and that for no other pretended cause, but their keeping that Communion, viz. with St. Iohn, which you and we know to have been due and Catholique Communion, was, or was not that Act of Diotrepbes done for that cause, properly and formally Schismaticall? At last we obtained an Answer that it was, for a reason which you assigned; because it contained in it a separation from St. John, and from the whole Church. We replied, That neither was that a punctual Answer to the Question, Was that Act, as done for that reason by us assigned, Schismatical, or no? And the reason you gave we told you, was not an Answer to us at all; for both might be reasons: for said we to you, you cannot pretend that your reason denies ours to be a reason. For 'twas possible (whether true or false, we had no necessity to enquire.) That that Act of Diotrepbes might be Schismaticall both for your reason and ours also. But if it were once confessed, that that Act of Diotrepbes

trephes was properly Schismaticall, for that reason alledged by us, viz. for that 'twas done for that onely pretended cause of their keeping due Catholique Communion, then had we evinced our cause, viz. that some unjust casting out of the Brethren out of the Church, as done for that unjust cause, was properly and formally Schismaticall, whether other reasons concurred, or preceded, or followed yours, or ours, concerned not the Elenchus at all, then as for your reason alledged, for that that Act did contain in it a separating himself from the whole Church, we replied this in effect, that as to your reason of separating himself, that though it were sufficient for us to the overthrow of your Thesis, which you had laid down in the head of your discourse, (viz. That there is no active Separation, save that of ones self from the whole Church, which can properly be termed Schisme) that Diotrephes unjust active Separation of the Brethren from the Church, as done for that most unjust cause, h. e. as such active unjust separation of the Brethren, was formally Schismaticall. If it were Schismaticall for your reason also (as thereby virtually separating himself also from  
St.

St. John and from the Church,) what did that hurt us, Who knew an Aēt might be Schisme for more reasons then one? and the nature of our definition and discourse tended to include many reasons, that might make an Aēt or Person Schismaticall, whiles you would have but one. We, who all along had granted your one, refuted now your deniall of our other, by alledging that Aēt of Diotrephes Schismaticall for our reason, which was other from yours; and you would neither grant nor deny our reason, but onely said another thing of your own, to which we then shewed, that we were willing to speak to it; that we might get you to confess, or deny our reason, (which if you had denied we offered the proof of it :) and thereupon follow those words of ours, onely thus in condescension to you spoken occasionally, but most truly; (on which you have spent more of the conference, then on the question it self :) viz. That we had our selves granted, yea contended, that he also, who separateth others unjustly from the Church Communion, doth thereby indeed (if not separate before) consequentially separate himself from the Church. Now because we could, and were willing to



condescend to you in some sense of his separating himself from the Church also, therefore you letting go the question almost, raise all your forces to extort from us, that though we alwayes said no, yet we must needs mean the same sort of separation of himself from the Church, in the same Acception of the word Church, wherein you contended for it. As if because we are willing to shew you in something like your Assertion, we can comply and consent unto what you contend for, therefore we must needs grant you all you contend for in that Saying of yours: And then our word (He) that is, every he, is one argument. and next our word (Also) that we had connected our proposition to yours by the word Also, is another. And the word (Consequentially) is made a fourth argument. Thin bubbles blown up of airy conjectures against our certain knowledge and declarations of our sense: for we admit our proposition to be universall (every he) as to the subject of the proposition, where the He is placed, but not to the Terminus à quo in the predicate. And what of Also? and for the word Consequentially we shall frait shew, that that it self upon your own urged principles, might have checkt your undertaking.

taking. Your reason, why that must be our sense, is, because our words, which we fell upon, say you, in treating of your words, must needs in every word in that whole sentence be taken in the same sense with yours. Whence derive you this Dominion in discourse? But that we might allow you, that every unjust Excommunicator (and not onely Diotrophes, there's one ampliation) doth separate himself, (there's one concession to you) and from the Church; (there's another concession to you) thus far we can: but did we put our selves under your power to extend our words for us, as far as you pleased, in that latitude, which you know we never expressed, and we know, we never meant. If Christ our Lord fell on those words of his, Let the dead bury their dead, in treating or answering, these words of another, Lord let me first go and bury my Father, h. e. my dead father, Luke 9. 59, 60. Shall any therefore obtrude upon Christs words, that dead in the subject of Christs proposition must in all consequence of discourse be needs understood in the same sense, wherein the man, whose words gave occasion to Christs words, had implied his Father to be dead? no necessity, no such law therefore.

## C. 53.

You swelled your Answer just now with three needless digressions ; and now you blow it up with as many needless repetitions. What, we pray you, required this whole leaf *in folio* ; and a page , repeating what you have said , and we answered over and over long before this? Had it not been sufficient for the present difficulty, to have repeated the sentence next before that of yours, to have shewed what force the word *Also* had? And yet in doing all you have been so long about, you have not done this, which was onely to have been done : neither give you any direct answer at all to our objection drawn from the word *Also* ; but onely say, *What of Also?* We told you *what* before ; and you saw it so clear, that you could not answer it ; and so you thought it best seemingly to slight it , by a *what of Also?* and say no more to it, because you could say nothing. But we will tell you, (since you will needs know it) *what of Also.* We had immediately before asserted, that those, who separate others unjustly from the visible Church, are not constituted formally Schismatiques by that

that unjust Excommunication *quà talis*, as such, but by some formality of Separation of ones self involved in it, because every Schismaticque separates himself from the Church. Now you joyn issue thus far with us, saying, *We grant that he also, &c. who separates others unjustly from the Church Communion, consequentially separates himself from the Church.* Now what can this *also* of yours signifie to a rationall person, save this, that you affirm, that separation from the Church to be done consequentially, which we say must be done formally, to constitute Schism, when others are unjustly separated from Church Communion. The word *Also* therefore manifestly imports, that you must speak of the Church in the latter part of this sentence, as we had done, that is, of the visible Hierarchicall Church; with this onely difference, that you say, that this separation happens *consequentially*, and we *primarily* and formally. Now to say, as you are forced to say, (for otherwise you were not able with any shew of probability to answer our Arguments) that you meant by *Church* here, onely the number of the lively members.

*bers of Christ, &c.* makes your *also* to have no connection at all with any thing, that we had said: for we never so much as made the least mention of the *lively members of Christ*, or dreamt of the word *Church* taken in that sense, wherein you now take it in the treaty of Schisme betwixt us: and thus you have heard *what of also*? And hereafter by comparing an other *also* of yours, p. 6. with this we shall tell you something more, of *what of also*?

Your instance from *Luke 9. 50, 60.* is nothing to your purpose: for it appears clearly by the very words themselves, that *dead* in the first part of the sentence is onely spiritually and metaphorically *dead*: for had it signified corporally or really *dead*, how could those *dead bury their dead*? That being connaturally an action of a living person; and so the proposition is neither dubious, nor equivocal, having light enough in it self to explicate it self; which yours had not. Neither say we, that when by occasion of anothers discourse one confers with them, that they are alwayes obliged to speak in the same sense, that the other did, unless they both signifie they intend to do so (as you

you did by the word *Also*; and our Saviour did not *Luke 9.*) and give no light in their proposition, whereby it may be gathered, that they speak in another sense, as we have shewed; you have not done, in this of yours.

P. 53.

Next we will shew you, that our words themselves, before ye had askt us the meaning of them, and we plainly told you, themselves might have told you, and checkt this your undertaking upon us. For did not we, who spake, know that our sense was, that in any unjust Excommunication of others, which were Schismaticall (which you did not deny Diotrephes to be) the unjust Separatour separated himself, or had separated himself before antecedently from the visible Church? Now when we expressly put in, that he did it consequentially (that was our word, that our meaning, and we have justified it) which yet we knew, was not, could not be your meaning; you could not but discern 'twas not our intent or profession, to comply with you in all your meaning and sense, but so far as truth would bear; which was not needful there to bound out at large.

C. 54.

## C. 54.

Who could gather what your sense was, or was not, but by your words? Where did you deliver, that in any unjust Excommunication of others, which were Schismaticall, the unjust Separatour separated himself, or had separate himself before, antecedently from the visible Church? Certainly if you had ever said so, you had both fully maintained an assertion against your selves, for then every unjust Excommunication of others, had not been a separation, and not of ones self, and you undertook to prove it was; and you had exposed your selves to all the objections, which we have made against this passage, p. 28. which you could not answer, but by flying to the invisible Church.

But whatsoever you say now of *Antecedently* being separated from the visible Church, could no way signifie, that one might not, *consequentially* to some act which he had done, separate himself from the visible Church also. For what contradiction is there in the one more then in the other? Thus if one separate others unjustly from the Church Communion, with so great a pride and obstinacy, that he



he chuses rather to separate himself from the whole Church by an universal rejection and rebellion against all his spiritual superiours, rather then receive them again into the Church, *consequently* to that unjust separation he separates himself from the whole visible Church. We say not, you were any way obliged to comply with us in all our meaning and sense, (as you here insinuate we do) but onely so far as your expresse words signifie you intend to comply with us, as here the word *Also* signifies.

## P. 54.

*Secondly, our very words shew to any, that we would purposely avoid to declare our intent of separation of the unjust Excommunicatour from the same Church Communion, from which he unjustly separated others: And therefore whereas, if we had intended what you resolve we must mean whether we did or no, the consequence and file of speech had required us to have spoke, that he also which separates others unjustly from the Church Communion, doth thereby indeed (if not separate before) consequentially separate himself from the Church Communion; but in the consequentiall separation*

*on we left out there the word Church Communion, then and altering the file of speech said onely, that he separates himself from the Church (viz. in our declared acception of the word Church) who unjustly separates others from the Church Communion.*

## C. 55.

What you say of separation from the *Church Communion* in the first part of your sentence, and of separating himself from the *Church* in the second, is a distinction without a difference: have not both you and we most frequently used both these tearms promiscuously for the same thing: nay, in our very definitions themselves, have not we used separation from the *Church*, and you from the *one body of Christ*, whereby we expressed our selves to mean the visible Hierarchicall Church, and you acknowledge you meant no other then we did, in your definition; and neither of us used the tearm from *Church Communion*, so that the word *Church* was to be understood by us both, to be more clearly signifying the same visible Church, then the term *Church Communion*, especially, seeing that you distinguish presently *Church Communion* into *internall* and *externall*;

externall; and that whosoever wilfully induces an other Catholique into mortall sin, causlessly and unjustly, separates him from the *internall Communion* of the Church, if not separate before.

But to shew unanswerably, that by *Church* here you must mean, the visible Hierarchicall Church, and by *also* the same signification of *Church*, and division from it which we signified, and by *dividing*, or *separating*, onely the externall separation from the Hierarchicall Church which we understood, (since you will needs force us to extremities) we will clearly deduce from your own words, whereto you relate in this place.

You say therefore, page 28. printed, *We have indeed our selves granted, yea contended, that he also who separateth others unjustly from the Church Communion, doth thereby indeed (if not separate before) consequentially separate himself from the Church.* Now the words wherein you say here, you granted, and contended thus much, are found page the 6. print, and there onely, before you writ this passage. Your words then, in that passage, page 6. are these, viz. *We wonder now to read you*

you saying, that active separation supposeth the person some way or other divided from the Church, whereas indeed the active separatour of himself is not supposed, but first becomes divided by that act of separating; and the active unjust separatour of others (if for keeping due Catholique Communion) thereby divides himself also. Thus you. Hence we argue against you thus. You say in the passage, p. 28. that what you affirm there, you had granted and contended before: that which you granted and contended before in this matter, is onely found p. 6. in the words now cited; those words, speak onely of Church, division, or separation from it in that sense, wherein we took the words Church and Separation, as appears by your citing us speaking of them in these words, viz. We wonder now to read you saying, that active separation supposeth the person some way or other divided from the Church. We speak there of Church and separation, onely understanding by Church, the whole visible Hierarchicall Church, and by separation, the externall separation from it, as appears evidently p. 5. c. 6. for we spake onely of that separation from the Church, whereby

by Schisme is committed, and that, both you and we expresse to be no other then the externall separation from the visible Hierarchicall Church; *Ergo, à primo ad ultimum*, you must speak onely of an externall Separation made from the visible Hierarchicall Church; when you say, *that he who separates others unjustly, &c. consequentially separates himself from the Church*, as you had granted, and contended before, p. 6. Now you cannot understand in the words, *page 6.* when you say, *And the active unjust Separatour of others (if for keeping due Catholique Communion) thereby divides himself also*, of any other Church, or division, then of that onely whereof you spake, in the former part of the sentence, that is, of an external division from the visible Hierarchicall Church, as most manifestly appears by the whole sentence, otherwise it could not be connected by the words *and*, and *also*, to the former part of the sentence, as it is when you say, *and the unjust Separatour of others, &c. thereby divides himself also*, h.e. as the Schismaticque in your definition, divides others directly, by an external division from the visible Church, so  
 he

he divides himself by unjust excommunication of others, externally from the visible Hierarchical Church *also*. For you say, and --- *thereby divides himself also; suppose,* from that Church, and by the same kinde of division, for you name no other; that is, divides himself by an externall division from the visible Hierarchicall Church.

Nay, have we not both of us used unjust separation, or excommunication from the Church: for a Separation from the *visible Church*, as it consists of Pastours and people, as it invincibly appears in the now cited words, p. 6. and the like is, p. 4. c. 5. and p. 5. c. 6. and again p. 6. line 7. and p. 7. c. 7. &c. Nay, even immediately before that passage p. 28. and presently after it, you use Church for the visible Hierarchicall Church: and never before that your proposition used it, save for that *visible Church*. What living man then could possibly have gathered from your using *Separation from the Church*, that you meant onely from the company of the lively members of Christ? In which sense neither of us before that, had ever used the word Church, as it relates to the controversie of Schisme.

## P. 55.

Now let all men that know what belongs to candour and ingenuity in interpreting mens words, judge betwixt you and us. As to Firmilian 'tis evident, that he meant to charge Pope Stephen, that his act, or attempt of unjust casting out others, was Schismaticall. Secondly, that thereby he both makes himself obnoxious to be cast out himself of the Churches externall Communion by the censure of the Church; which we also expressly told you was our minde of a properly, formally, and clearly unjust Ejectour of others; and also in his own Act made himself an apostate from the Communion of the Ecclesiasticall unity; which is but the same with that, wherein you know Sr. Augustin describes the sin of Schisme; *Heretici dis-sensionibus iniquis a fraternâ Charitate diffiliunt.* And as to what you are necessitated to assume to the framing of any argument against us from Firmilian, (for all the Ecclesiastical Communion and unity must be visible) is it self an untruth, and needs to be proved: for there is an internall, as well as an externall Communion to be held by Christs command, with the Catholique Church, with the visible Church, in both  
Accepti-



*The new Acception of the  
 acceptions of the word Church; which in-  
 ternall Communion whosoever doth not keep  
 with the visible Church, cannot be saved,  
 but hath made himself an Apostate (if be-  
 fore he had it) from the Communion (in  
 some important sense thereof) of the Church  
 unity; or, (which is all one, in Firmilians  
 word) of Ecclesiasticall unity. Sixthly say  
 you, and another follower after this sixth,  
 for some number and some pages do these ve-  
 ry objections about the sense of a line of ours  
 fill up; no wonder, if the dissolving of pre-  
 tended objections must be longer.*

**C. 56.**

You have said expressly, (as we have  
 noted in another place, p. 306. print)  
 that by Ecclesiasticall Communion, or  
 Unity, is to be understood onely the ex-  
 ternall Communion, or Unity of the visi-  
 ble Church, as will appear by your Au-  
 thenticall Papers, how then come you  
 now to contradict your selves, and say it  
 is also *internall Communion*?

And your Answer here to us quite de-  
 stroyes your Argument from *Firmilian*  
 against us; so hard are you pressed. For  
 if by *Ecclesiasticall Unity* and cutting off  
 ones self from all, is to be understood one-  
 ly

ly of the *internall Communion*, then you could never prove against us from the example of *Firmilian* (which you mainly labour to do through one half of this present controversie) that unjust casting out others from the Church Communion is *Schisme*: you having taken onely this *Medium* to prove it, as appears in the first proposall of that Argument in these words of *Firmilian*, *Dum enim putas te posse omnes abstinere, teipsum ab omnibus abstinnisti: Excidisti enim teipsum, (noli te fallere) &c.* For whilest thou thoughtest thy self able to cut off all, thou hast cut off thy self from all, &c. p. 28. print. If therefore *Stephen*, according to your interpretation, cut off himself onely from the internall Unity or Communion of the Church, how could you ever frame an Argument from those words of *Firmilian*, that *Stephen* was a Schismaticque for excommunicating others unjustly (as you say) unless you frame it thus; *Firmilian* accuses *Stephen* to be a Schismaticque, because by excommunicating others unjustly, he cut off himself from the internall Communion of the Church; which you your self confesse to be of no force.

T

For

For you exprelly acknowledge both in your definition, and many others passages of this conference, that separation from the *externall Communion of the visible Church*, as it is a *politique body*, composed of *Pastours, and People*, is essentially necessary to Schisme. Or the force of your Argument drawn from the words of *Firmilian* must be this, viz. *Firmilian* accuses *Stephen* the Pope to have excommunicated others unjustly, therefore he accuses him to be a Schismaticque; which is not a proof, but a begging of the question, which is whether, he who excommunicates others unjustly be a Schismaticque: and the main endeavour of your Adversaries is to maintain, that the unjust Excommunication of others alone, makes no man a Schismaticque. Seeing therefore *Firmilians* words (as you are now forced to interpret them) neither prove *Stephen* to be a schismatick, by separating himself from the external Communion of the whole visible Church consequentially; nor can ever evince against us, that *Firmilian* held him to be a Schismaticque for this sole cause, that he separated others unjustly from the *externall Communion*

munion of the visible Church by Excommunication; who sees not that this Argument of yours is wholly enervated, and evacuated of all force, by your own explication of it; so far are you driven by occurring difficulties, that you cannot possibly solve them, otherwise, then by destroying your own Arguments: for the whole force of your Argument reduced to a sylogisme will be this, *viz.* To prove that whosoever separates another unjustly from the externall Communion of the Church (which is your position) is a Schismaticque by this sylogisme.

Whosoever is truly accused to separate another unjustly from the externall Communion of the Church is a Schismaticque: But *Stephen* was truly accused to separate others unjustly from the Externall Communion of the Church. *Ergo*, *Stephen* was a Schismaticque.

Is not this plainly to prove *idem per idem*, the same by the same? Judge Reader if it be not.

And thus we have endeavoured to shew the inconsistency and nullity of the new acception, which you have embraced of the word *Church*, and of your new

*formalis ratio*, formall reason, or nature of Schisme. Out of the consideration of which we propose this important question, *viz.* Whether in setting upon this conference, by evincing your intent against us in this question, that is, in convincing us to be Schismaticques, your intent was not upon that conviction, to induce us to leave our Religion, and embrace yours, if we would attain salvation. If you intended not this, to what purpose have you taken so much pains to convince us of Schisme; seeing, even supposing that we were convinced of it, we shall adhere to our Religion, and oppose yours much as we did before. If you intended it, why then have you constituted such a *formall reason*, or nature of Schisme, that though we were convinced to be guilty of some true Schisme, we still remain true members of the Catholique Church, and so true and real Catholiques; that conviction not hindering us to be as capable of Salvation, as we were before. Whereas if we convince you of that Schisme, which is contained in our definition, you must confess, that you are wholly incapable of Salvation,

tion, so long as you continue it; and so cannot possibly be saved, unless you quit your religion, and convert your selves to ours. We desire a speedy and direct Answer to this.

---

CHAP.

*Containing the second Ar-  
gument, drawn from  
the Testimony of Fir-  
milian.*

S E C T. I.

*The Proposition of the second  
Argument.*

P. I.

**S**Econdly, from the Testimony of the An-  
cient Primitive Church. Firmilia-  
nus, (in St. Cyprians judgement) a holy  
Catholique Bishop of Cesarea (much with-  
in the first three hundred years) of whom  
the great and renowned Dionysius Bishop of  
Alexandria, in Eusebius thus witnesseth,  
That he (this Firmilianus) was one of the  
illustrious Bishop of the most famous Cities;  
who was also a part of both the Ancient An-  
tiochian Councils held before the Nicene,  
the



the one against the Novatians, the other against Paulus Samosatenus, that Arch heretick; whose Epistle hath ever been recorded and preserved amongst St. Cyprians Epistles, to whom he was contemporarie and friend. This Catholique Bishop Firmilianus (epist. 75. amongst St Cyprians, num. 20.) saith thus to Stephen the Pope, or Bishop of Rome, So that the Scriptures of God speak of no other more then of thee; A wrathful man stirs up strife, and an angry man heaps up sins. For how great strifes and contentions hast thou caused throughout the Churches of the whole world! How great a sin hast thou heightened to thy self, when thou cuttest thy self off from so many flocks! For thou hast cut off thy self. Do not deceive thy self. For as much as he is truly Schismaticall, who hath made himself an Apostate from the Communion of Ecclesiasticall Unity. For while thou thoughtest to cut off, or abstain all others from thee, thou hast onely cut off, or abstained thy self from all.

C. I

As to the instance and story of Firmilianus, we are to consider him in three different

different States. The one before he fell upon the matter of Rebaptization of Heretiques : and so long as he remained in this state, he was deservedly esteemed a Catholique and holy Bishop by *Dionysius of Alexandria*. The second, while he defended the error of Rebaptization of Heretiques ; in which erroneous state he wrote this Epistle against *Stephen* ; and in this *patiebatur aliquid humani* , as *St. Austin* pronounceth of *St. Cyprian*, whilest he favoured the same error : and in this condition, his words cited by you are of no more Authority, then the like words of *St. Cyprian* were against the same *Stephen*. His third state was , when he revoked his error , and returned again to the Doctrine and Unity of the Catholique Church ; as *St. Austin contra Crescon. libr. 3. cap. 3.* (as *Cardinall Perron* cites him) and *St. Hierome contra Luciferian*. witnesses the Bishops fallen to that error to have done. So that after his death by reason of this his return and revocation , he was deservedly reputed and stiled a holy Bishop.

P. 2.

*As to our proof from Firmilianus, we think*

think it is not avoided by saying, Firmilianus was in the error of Rebaptization of Heretiques, and that he did therein pati aliquid humani, as you say St. Austin pronounced of St. Cyprian, while he favoured the same error. True, we admit St. Austins judgement and your application of it, viz. That Firmilianus and St. Cyprians case was the same as to this: and this thus by both agreed, we proceed and shew, that Cyprian (and therefore Firmilian, if otherwise Catholique and Holy (which none can deny) ought to be, and was by St. Austins Testimony above a hundred times, during the time of that his error of Rebaptization of Heretiques, and expressly at the same time supposing and mentioning that his error, yet avowed to be a holy and most charitable Bishop, and in Catholique Communion. And we adde that which we desire may be observed, that the holy Father St. Augustin commends him for words against Stephen the Bishop of Rome; and for his justifying himself and his party (in which was Firmilian) against the Popes pretense of excommunicating them. This if we prove, you have not then brought any answer, that dissolves our Argument. For the

418 Firmilians Testimony no proof.

summe of your Answer is, That Firmilians words are of no more Authority, then the like words of St. Cyprian. So you. Now we will produce the like words of St. Cyprian; and shew, how St. Austin, after disse. ting from St. Cyprians opinion about Rebaptizing Heretiques, yet commends his holy Catholique Communion, and charitable pious soul at the same time; and justifies and commends his words of like stoutness against Pope Stephen, and for avowing their exemption from any such pretended power in Stephen to cut them off from Catholique Communion; and also that St. Austin objects to the Donatists the crime of Schisme, not to be excused by their alledging Cyprian and those other African Bishops words or example; and proves, that they separated themselves from the Catholique Church; which St. Cyprian and his Councell at Carthage did not. And thus he proves, viz. that they did not separate themselves (which the Donatists did) many times over and again repeating this reason, and no other; because St. Cyprian and his Councell professed, that they would judge no man, separate, or remove no man from his right of Communion, though he differ

differ from them in judgement herein; and for their adding this reason, why they excommunicated not others for it. For say they, Neither doth any of us make himself Bishop of Bishops, and by tyrannicall terrour compell his Colleagues, or Fellow-Bishops to a necessity of obeying.

C. 2.

Send us the Authorities to prove, that which you here affirm.

P. 3.

We thus begin to alledge the Authorities for proving what we affirm. St. Augustin. lib. 2. contr. Donatist. cap. 4. (and as he doth often elsewhere) shews Cyprians pious disposition of minde, even all the while he was in that error; avowing it plain from his words, that he would most easily have corrected his opinion, if any one would have shewed him. And so cap. 1, & 2. that he might shew Cyprians peaceable soul, how he was and would be in the unity of peace with those that dissented from him in that opinion. He (St. Augustin) thus says, alledging the words of the Councell of Carthage, wherein were Cyprian, and as may be supposed, Firmilian. When very many;

many Bishops had met at *Carthage*, out of the Provinces of *Africa*, *Numidia*, *Mauritania*, with Priests and Deacons, and a very great part of the people being present, --- it remains, that each of us produce our judgements in this matter, judging no man, separating or removing no man from right of Communion, though he differ from us in his judgement. For neither doth any of us make himself Bishop of Bishops, (*clearly hinting Stephen the Pope, who they thought did so*) or by tyrannicall terror compell his Colleagues, or Fellow-Bishops to a necessity of obeying. Seeing that every Bishop hath his proper arbitrement of his own power, for the lawfull libertie given him; and may no more be judged by another Bishop, then he can judge another. But let us expect the judgement of the Lord of all; Jesus Chr<sup>st</sup> (*saieth he*) who onely and alone hath power, both of seating us in the government of his Church, and of judging of our Act. Thus far the Councell, Cyprian, Firmilian, &c. And then upon their words addes St. Augustin, Now let the proud and swelling necks of Heretiques, the mad Donatists, if they dare:

dare, lift up themselves against the humility of this Speech (above set down) and what say you to this? You are wont to object to us Cyprians letters, Cyprians judgement, Cyprians Councell, &c. Thus far St. Augustin.

The same St. Austin. libr. 6. contra Donatist. cap. 6; 7. again repeats, and again highly extolls those words in the Councell of Cyprian, and also Firmilian, and with which Cyprian begins the Councell; and by which (saith he) Cyprians peaceable soul; and abounding with the brest of Charity is declared. Where he subjoyns

“ the repeated words before cited, -- Quid  
 “ sentiamus, proferamus, neminem judi-  
 “ cantes, aut a jure Communionis aliquem  
 “ si diversum senserit, amoventes. Ne-  
 “ que enim quisquam nostrum Episcopum  
 “ se Episcoporum constituit, aut Tyrannico  
 “ terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem Colle-  
 “ gas suos adigit: quando habeat omnis  
 “ Episcopus, pro licentiâ libertatis & po-  
 “ testatis sue arbitrium proprium; tam-  
 “ que ab alio judicari non potest; quàm nec  
 “ ipse possit alterum judicare. Sed expecte-  
 “ mus universi judicium Domini nostri Jesu  
 “ Christi, qui unus & solus habet potesta-  
 tem,



422 Firmilians Testimony no proof.

"tem, & preponendi nos in Ecclesie sue gubernatione, & de Actu nostro judicandi." All these words St. Austin cites as an Indication of Cyprian's peaceable soul, and abounding with the breasts of Charity.

Those persons, Cyprian and his Colleagues, whiles they were in their error of Rebaptizing Heretiques; and those words spoken by them, whiles they were so, doth St. Augustin repeat often and commend highly, and by those words acquits those persons of all schisme; (which words themselves Stephen the Pope, who excommunicated those African Bishops, must needs accuse as schismaticall.)

And now we adde, that as Firmilian judged, that active unjust separating of others from the Churches Communion, was schismaticall, in his words by us cited: so St. Augustin (when he received those acts of that Councell of Carthage, wherein Cyprian and Firmilian, as may be supposed, were) declares himself to be of the same judgement; for so he clears them of Africa from being uncharitable, (and therefore to be sure from being schismaticall, and from being separated from the unity of Christs Body,) because being only in an er-

your, which he extenuates, as in an obscure  
 question at that time, libr. 2. contr. Do-  
 natist. cap. 5. These professed not to se-  
 parate any others from the Communion  
 of Christs Body for their dissent. So St.  
 Augustin libr. 2. De Baptismo con. r. Do-  
 natist, cap. 6. How then did not Cyprian,  
 & those so many of his Colleagues perish,  
 saith he, who chuse yet rather to commu-  
 nicate with those such, then to be separa-  
 ted from the unity. Cyprian saying, saith  
 he, we judging no man, nor putting  
 away any from his right of Communion,  
 if he differ from us in his judgement &c.  
 Where St. Austin for his proof, That those  
 African Bish ps chose not to be separated  
 from the unity, brings chiefly that Saying,  
 We judging no man, nor putting away  
 any from his right of Communion for  
 his different judgement. Where St. Austin  
 plainly supposeth, that if they had separated,  
 thrust, or put away others from the unity of  
 Communion, they had in that very so doing,  
 been themselves separated from the unity.  
 Therefore separating others unjustly, in St.  
 Austins judgement, enders him that so does,  
 himself separated from the unity. And  
 Ibid, cap. 5. How he held the unity with  
 dissen-

dissentours we see; for he saith, judging no man, and removing no man from his right of Communion, though he dissent, &c. For we are men: whence in some thing to think otherwise then the matter in truth is, is a temptation incident to Humanity; but by too much loving their own opinion, or envying better judgements, to come even to the Sacrilege of cutting off Communion, and creating a Schisme, or Heresie, is Diabolical presumption. *In which words St. Augustin plainly imports, that by putting away, removing, or separating others unjustly from their right of Communion, out of too much being in love with their own opinion, and envying better, (if so they had done) they had proceeded to the Sacrilege of Schisme and Diabolical presumption. So also lib. 5. cap. 17. St. Augustin saith, In those words many things are to be considered, by which the brightness of Christian Charity shines forth in this man, who loved the beauty of Gods house, and the place of the Tabernacle of his Habitation, -- &c. Lastly, because prescribing no man; nor prejudging any; but that every Bishop may do, what he thinks*

thinks fit, having the free power of his own judgement, &c. --- For a greater force of vertue was eminent in him, that, when as that question not having been yet discussed, was in doubt, he thinking differently from many of his Colleagues, held so great moderation, that by no blot of Schisme would he mutilate the Holy Society of Gods Church. *Thus St. Austin. Where St. Austin calls the active mutilation of the holy society of Gods Church, by judging any unjustly, the blot of Schisme.*

S E C T. 2.

¶ *The Opponents first misconceit evidenced.*

C. 3.  
**I**N the pursuit of your instance of *Firmilianus*, I scarce finde any thing, save a numerous heaping of Misconceits one upon another.

First, you misconceive our comparing *Firmilianus* to St. Cyprian, which you would have to be in the error of Re-baptization. Now we compare them not  
(as

426 *The first Misconceit discovered*  
(as being not to our present purpose) in  
that, but in the words, which they both  
wrote against Stephen Bishop of Rome, as  
appears by our words, viz. *The second*  
(state of Firmilian) *whiles he defended the*  
*error of Rebaptisation of Heretiques ;*  
*in which erroneous state he writ his Epistle*  
*against Stephen : and in this (that is , in*  
*this Epistle, or the writing of it) Patie-*  
*batur aliquid humani , as St. Austin pro-*  
*nounceth of St. Cyprian, whiles he favour-*  
*ed the same error. And in this condition*  
*his words by you cited are of no more autho-*  
*rity , then the like words of St. Cyprian*  
*against the same Stephen. Where the*  
*comparison pressed by us is clearly made*  
*in words, and in nothing else.*

P 4.

*Here you vanquish, (as you suppose) all*  
*before you ; heaps upon heaps , but in con-*  
*cept onely : and we shall shew, that yours*  
*are those heaps of Misconcepts. First, our*  
*comparing (after you) Firmilian with Cy-*  
*prian was not in their error of Rebaptiza-*  
*tion onely, nor was your comparing of them*  
*onely in the words, which they both writ*  
*against Stephen Bishop of Rome. But as*  
*to our parts we compared them also in their*  
*words,*

The first Misconceit discovered 427  
words, which they both writ against Stephen  
Bishop of Rome (and so far you acknow-  
ledge you had first compared them) and we  
added those words not to be excepted to, not-  
withstanding their error of Rebaptization,  
in which they both were, and both also  
then were, when they wrote the severall  
words related to against Pope Stephen.  
Therefore if such error of Rebaptization  
be said to diminish the Authority of their  
words, it must do it in both, or in neither;  
in St. Cyprian also, or not in Firmilian.  
Indeed in neither. Now we think, not onely  
we, but you also compared them, not onely in  
their words, but in their words considered as  
spoken by them both respectively; whiles  
both of them favoured the same error of  
Rebaptization; which we also considered in  
them both, or either, no further, then as to  
any pretended diminishing or not diminish-  
ing, the Authority of their words: This is all  
we did, or needed to do; and did not you as  
much, even by your own acknowledgement  
in your very reason here alledged by you, why  
you did not? Hear me now you repeating  
your own former word, even the first com-  
paring of these two together, which was  
mentioned at all in this conference [whiles  
he

428 *The first Misconceit discovered*  
he defended the error of Rebaptization  
of Heretiques, in this erroneous state, he  
(*Firmilian*) wrote this Epistle against  
Stephen, and in this *patiebatur aliquid hu-*  
*mani*, as St. *Augustin* pronounceth of  
Cyprian, whilest he favoured the same er-  
rour.] And in this condition his words by  
you cited are of no more Authority then  
the like words of St. Cyprian against the  
same Stephen.] Why? Did not you here  
compare both their words with both their  
favouring the same error of Rebaptiza-  
tion, when they both wrote those words? and  
yet you would prove hence, that you com-  
pare them in words, and in nothing else;  
and tell us, that our first misconceit is,  
that you compared them in their error of  
Rebaptization also. Why? Did you not  
here and there, as much as we, compare  
them in their words against Stephen? and  
that not simply in their words, but as to the  
Authority of those their words, alike to be  
diminished or not diminished for their being  
written by them, when both of them favor-  
ed the same error? And do not you whiles  
you say in this condition (*viz.* of their fa-  
vouring the same error) *Firmilians*  
words are of no more authority, then the  
like



like words of St. Cyprian against the same Stephen, viz. (*when he favoured the same error.*) Do not you here suppose, or grant to us, That Firmilians and Cyprians like words are not of more or less Authority, one then other, from their favouring that error, forasmuch as both favoured the same? And this is all the use we made of the comparing these two, as appears by our very next reply after your so conferring them. Our words are B. 7. As to our proof from Firmilian we think it not avoided by your saying, Firmilian was in the error of Rebaptization of Heretiques, and that he did therein *pati aliquid humani*, as you cite St. Austin pronouncing of St. Cyprian, while he favoured the same error. True, we admit Saint Austins judgement, and your application of it; (*viz. this your application we meant*) that Firmilian and Cyprians case was the same as to this, (*viz. this condition of their like favouring the same error, when they both wrote those like words against the same Stephen.*) And then we proceed, considering them both in their error of Rebaptization, (*if, said we, for we did not make you say so,* Otherwise Firmilian were

208

430 *The first Misconceit discovered.*

were a Catholique and Holy Bishop, which none can deny.) So we argue from the comparison, and from your concession; and produce like words of stoutness of St. Cyprian against Pope Stephen, and those highly commended by S. Augustin. Where now we pray you, is our misconceiving your comparison of Firmilian to St. Cyprian? We think still, it is the very sense of the words, and after rightly made by us Argumentative against you.

C. 4.

That every one may percive, whether you stand rightly charged by us in certain misconceits of our words in Firmilians case, it is necessary to cite our mutuall answers and replies, as they stand, *verbatim*. You having therefore cited Firmilians words against Stephen the Pope, to prove your assertion, we returned this Answer, viz. *The second state of Firmilian was whilst he defended the error of Rebaptization of Heretiques: in which erroneous state he wrote this Epistle against Stephen, and in this patiebatur aliquid humani, as St. Augustin pronounceth of St. Cyprian, whilst he favoured the same error: and in this condition his* (Firmili-  
ans

ans) words by you cited are of no more authority, then the like words of St. Cyprian were against the same Stephen. Thus we. Where it is evident, that the words, and in this *patiebatur aliquid humani*, are referred to Firmilian's Epistle, and not to his error of Rebaptization; for we say, he wrote this Epistle, and in this *patiebatur*, &c. The reply, which you make to this our answer, is contained in these words viz. As to our proof from Firmilian's case, we think it not avoided by saying, Firmilian was in the error of Rebaptization of Heretiques, and that he did therein *pati aliquid humani*, as you say, St. Augustin pronounced of St. Cyprian, whilest he favoured the same error. Where you clearly make us refer these words *pati aliquid humani* to the sole error of Rebaptization, and not to the Epistle, or words of Firmilian, quite contrary to our express words, which whether it be a misconception or no, let the Auditory judge, and we require your particular answer to this. That therefore which we denied in our rejoinder to these words of yours was, that you made us compare Firmilian and St. Cyprian in their error of Rebaptization,

432 *The first Misconceit discovered.*

tion, in words wherein we compared them not in that, viz. in saying, *Patiebatur aliquid humani*; and by abstracting them from *Firmilians* Epistle, to which we applied them, you gave occasion to think, that by them we compared not the Epistle of *Firmilian* and Saint *Cyprian* against *Stephen* together, which we onely did in those word, *Patiebatur aliquid humani*, and consequently, that seeing these words of ours, as you misconceived, were not a comparison of their Epistles, you bore the Auditory in hand, that we compared them onely by force of these words, in their errour expressly and immediately, though in order to the diminishing the Authority of their words. Your proving therefore, that we compared them in their errour, helps nothing to acquit you from the misconceit of our words, unless you shew, that we compared them in it by those words, whereto we joyned and referred *pati aliquid humani*, as you say.

S E C T.

## SECT. 3.

¶ *The Opponents second and third Miscon-  
cept maintained against them.*

## C. 5.

SEcondly, you misconceive, when you impose upon us, *That we are both agreed, that Firmilians and St. Cyprians case was the same, as to this; that is, in relation to the error of Rebaptization.* For where said we so? Neither indeed could we with truth say so. For St. Cyprian was never excommunicated by Stephen, much lesse remained obstinately for a time in that Excommunication, as Firmilian was, and did. Witness *Enseb. libr. 7. Histor. cap. 4.* which makes a main difference in their cases. Thirdly, you misconceive the condition of Firmilianus in your Parenthesis, when you say, *We shew that St. Cyprian (and therefore Firmilianus, if otherwise, that is, abstracting from his error of Rebaptization, Catholique and Holy, which no man can deny.)* Thus you. Now this is very untrue. For abstracting from his precise error of Rebaptization

V

we

we expressly deny, that he continued an Holy Bishop, all the time that he stood obstinately against Stephen under Excommunication.

## P. 5.

*Our second Misconceit, which you charge us with, will also prove onely your own presently, viz. That we would impose upon you, that we are both agreed, that Firmilians and St. Cyprians case was the same, as to this, h. e. in relation to the error of Rebaptization; but if you mean by, in relation to the error of Rebaptization, further then in relation of their words to their favouring the same error (which was the onely thing then as yet alleged against the Authority of the words of Firmilian) if you mean any more then this, (and this you did as much as we, and before us) we ask you, which of us doth impose now? When you interpret those our words (as to this) as you please, that you may afterwards be displeased with them. For we said no more: and as to comparing them, both in all things throughout in that error, 'twas not our purpose or concernment. For we have you confessing, that Firmilian retracted that error; which St. Augustin himself*

himself doubts, whether it can be shewn, that ever St. Cyprian did, and therefore Firmilian held it less tenaciously than Cyprian. And what is our Argument hurt by this; but rather strengthened by this disparity? Though this we then urged not, because we needed no more, then you had then granted, that they, whom we and you compared in their words against Pope Stephen, had been by you and us also compared and considered, as favouring the same error of Rebaptization of Heretiques; and at the same time, when they both wrote those like words. But you go on to endeavour to finde such disparity, if you can, as shall take all Authority from Firmilians words against the same Stephen, and you are resolved to fall foul on Firmilian; and expressly deny, that though St. Cyprian continued an holy Bishop all the time, that he persisted in his error of Rebaptization, (or if you now think not, we pray tell us so, and whether then you contradict not therein St. Augustin?) Yet Firmilian did not continue an Holy Bishop all the while he remained in that error of Rebaptization, (for reasons you assigne.) We hear your charge, which you must be sure to make good now; else we must tell



you, 'twill be a great criminall calumny in you to take away the righteousness of the righteous, the holiness of the holy from him, that your undertaken opinion, definition, and sentence may not be impeacht, (which Firmilian so irreconcileably contradicts.) Are you then the Actores and Impleaders, who have undertaken to make good the charge against this renowned Bishop, that (for the time you assign after his once being a Catholique and holy Bishop) he did not continue an holy Bishop? If you have taken the hardiness thus to accuse (as we conceive, with great injustice) we shall be admitted before all charitable Christians, with all equitable Heathens, to plead against you in the defence of this deceased, renowned, primitive Bishop, (that he may not be hurt by calumny without proof) because he hath left upon record a good profession, that is, found to justifie our reformed Church, and to lay the Schisme at the door of all Tyrannicall unjust Ejectours of others, though it were the Bishop of Rome, even then also, when Bishops of Rome were much other then they are now.

To receive your charge therefore, first, you cannot but acknowledge, and you have  
acknow-

acknowledged, that this Firmilian was (as first in your first state you allow him) deservedly esteemed a Catholique and holy Bishop; and you admit the witness of Dionysius of Alexandria for it, though he no where stints the time for it, or makes exception to it, as you do. Now how comes he to be no holy, no Catholique Bishop, for the time wherein he angred you, by thus avowing, that unjust ejection of others out of the Church, as such, is Schisme? Why? that he was in the error of Rebaptization of Heretiques, you acknowledge did not make him no Catholique, no holy Bishop. For St. Cyprian (while St. Cyprian, while a holy Catholique Bishop) was, you know, in the same error of Rebaptization of Heretiques; and therefore you are fain to add, that abstracting from his precise error of Rebaptization, you expressly deny, that he continued a holy Bishop; these are your words. Now then we are to attend what you lay to his charge, abstracting from that error in that then obscure question, from that which was common to him with the still holy and Catholique Bishop Cyprian. We will omit nothing, that you bring to justify your heavy accusation of him.

First, he was excommunicated by Stephen the Bishop of Rome. Secondly, he remained obstinately, say you, for a time in that Excommunication; and he did not you adde, continue a holy Bishop all the time, that he stood so obstinately against Stephen under Excommunication. Either these things or nothing, are that which you have laid to his charge. Come we therefore to enquire, how you prove these two things; and secondly, how these two, or either of them, if proved, render Firmilian of a deservedly esteemed Holy Catholique Bishop, now no Holy Bishop, when he writes that we cite out of him against you. For the proof of the latter you bring nothing, viz. that these things, if true, render him no holy Bishop; and for the proof of the former, that he was excommunicated, and stood obstinately against Stephen under Excommunication, you prove onely by the witness of the words that are found in Eusebius lib. 7. Histor. cap. 4. But first doth your meer conceiving him, (if those two things were true) no Holy Bishop, make him therefore no Holy Bishop? Or are we likely to yield you without proof, that his meerly being excommunicated by Stephen

Bishop

- *Bishop of Rome, makes him no holy Bishop? Or are we likely to yield, that his standing out under that, which he contested and complained of as an unjust Excommunication, rendred him no holy Bishop? This should have been proved, and not it, though the matter of fact had been witnessed to be true, lest as a sufficient proof of his being no holy Bishop; in your Dispute with us, where this your proof is part of the very question, (and so not meet to prove it self) whether the Bishop of Rome himself (or any other Ejectour) may not be an unjust Ejectour; and being such, may not be Schismaticall, and the ejected an holy person: yea, it is yet not denied by you, but that the Bishop of Rome may be an unjust ejectour at least; and if he may, then may Firmilian continue an holy Bishop, non obstante Stephens excommunicating of him.*

*Did Irenæus, and the rest of the holy Catholique Bishops of France, think these Eastern Bishops, whom Victor had excommunicated, (though Victor had as much the Truth on his side, in the question of keeping Easter, as Stephen had in the obscure question of Rebaptizing of Heretiques) no longer holy Catholique Bishops? See Ire-*

neus words in Eusebius. Were those holy Fathers of the fifth Sacred Oecumenical Council no longer Holy Catholique Bishops, when Pope Vigilius Excommunicated all who proceeded to treat or condemn the Tria Capitula, which yet they proceeded to examine, and finally condemned, under an Anathema, as Heresie? For our parts we believe, that sometime some Holy Catholique Bishops have been, are still Holy Catholique Bishops, non obstante, have been and are the more Holy Catholique Bishops, for having been and for being excommunicated by the Bishop of Rome, that is, haply for being more just then he; and yet more holy Catholique for their standing out (and the longer time, yet the more holy and Catholique, and onely he the while the more unjust) against such his unjust excommunication, oft without cause, yea not seldom for the cause of Honesty, and of Catholique Doctrine or Practice, without Jurisdiction oft-times, and sometimes against them, who have Jurisdiction themselves over him, (as the fifth Oecumenicall Council had over Pope Viginius :) So little proof have you brought to us of your accusation of Firmilian to be,

as

as then, no holy Bishop, or of diminishing the Authority of his words against your cause, the end of your accusation.

But yet further after all this, what if you have said nothing in proof of the excommunication it self, when you have brought Eusebius, lib. 7. Histor. cap. 4? What if nothing can be brought, why you should say, that Firmilian was excommunicated by Stephen (though he threatned him together with his Colleagues) more then may be brought, that Saint Cyprian was, who yet, you contend, was not excommunicated by Stephen?

In that of Eusebius, lib. 7. Histor. cap. 4. there is nothing of his either standing out obstinately (no mention of obstinacy, nor of standing out, &c. though whosoever is at any time excommunicate must be so for some time.) Nay, what if nothing of his being excommunicated by Stephen (more then elsewhere of Cyprians being excommunicated by Stephen,) who, you know, was not? No more words there can be alledged, sounding this way, then these words onely, ἐπετάλαξε -- ὡς ὑδὲ ἐκείνοις κοινωνήσων δια τὴν αὐτὴν ταύτην τὴν αἰτίαν, ἐπειδὴ ἴδus αἰρετικὸς φησὶν ἀνακαταλίσσας. He had wrote an

Epistle.--how that he would not communicate with them for this very cause; for that, *saith he*, they rebaptize Heretiques. *Where Stephen, by Letter, threatens* (and that is not the same with doing what is threatned) the Bishops of Cilicia, Capadocia, Galatia, and the Conterminous Nations, that he would not communicate with them, neither for the very same cause; for that, *saith he*, they rebaptize Heretiques. *Where observe these words not with them neither, import the same written to the other, h. e. to the African Bishops, who agreed with the Eastern Bishops therein.* Secondly, the reason of his Commination, he repeats barely for the same cause with the other simply; for that, *saith he*, they rebaptize Heretiques, without any aggravation on Firmilians part more then on Cyprians; or on the Eastern Bishops, more then on the African, as to their manner of holding Rebaptization. *Quia rebaptizant Hereticos, is all the charge here, that Stephen layes to Firmilian, or any of them: and did not Cyprian so? and his African Councell so?* Thirdly, what if that last *ἡ κοινὴ γνώμη* *κε' 9. 15*, if he had done what he did threaten,



threaten, was not excommunication? [*ὃς κοινωήσω*, I will not communicate with you] may be, and oft hath been said, and duly, from equalls to equalls; yea, may be said of Inferiours to degenerate Superiours in some sense, as by Bishops to Hereticall Patriarchs, (such as Nestorius, Macedonius, Paulus Samosatenus, Dioscorus) but excommunication alwayes confessedly is the Act of the Superiour, or pretended Superiour, to Inferiours: For it is an Act of the proper power of the Keyes, which alwayes issue from the person that hath jurisdiction, as a Superiour, or pretends to have. So might possibly Stephen pretend, we grant, but he did not pretend in these words, *ὃς κοινωήσω* 'anxious, much less is he proved to have excommunicated them in these words, or in any other of that place in Eusebius. Little have you said to prove, that Firmilianus was excommunicated, much less that he had deserved it, or why he was not a holy Catholique Bishop, notwithstanding that his error in an obscure question undefined. You have brought in a very heavy charge against a holy Catholique Bishop, by your own confession; (if you cannot prove any subsequent

quent accusation, beside his precise error of Rebaptization) and not any real proof. Onely you had great need to have his authority diminished if you could; and so you have tried, and bring nothing but good will: and yet again we bid you try, and do challenge you to shew in all Antiquity one evil word spoken of him (abstracting that which for holy Cyprians sake, and St. Augustins judgement of him, you have been enforced to abstract, his meer error of Rebaptization.) Now then your action falling to the ground for want of evidence, and nothing found against Firmilian, we will shew you, what we fear you knew, how much good Antiquity believed and spake of him constantly, without your exception, or limitation of time (for the no evil, that you can alledge.)

## C. 6.

Your second misconception, in making us to agree with you, that Firmilians and St. Cyprians case was the same in order to the error of Rebaptization, is grounded in these words of yours next ensuing to the former, viz. True, we admit St. Augustins judgement and your application of it, viz. that Firmilians and  
St.

St Cyprians case was the same as to this; and this thus by both agreed, we proceed and shew, that Cyprian (and therefore Firmilian, if otherwise Catholique and holy, which none can deny) ought to be, and was by St. Augustins testimony, above a hundred times, during the time of that his error of Rebaptizatiot of Heretiques, and expressly at the same time supposing and mentioning that his error, yet allowed to be a most holy, and most charitable Bishop, and in Catholique Communion. Whence it is evident, that you make us say and agree with you, that the case of these two was so much the same, that we must hold, that Firmilian was as holy and charitable a Bishop, and as much in Catholique Communion, all the time he held Rebaptization of Heretiques, as St. Cyprian (according to St. Augustin) was all that time: which how far it was, not onely from our saying and meaning, and from truth but even from your own opinion of Firmilian; (who must confess, that he was far inferiour to St. Cyprian both in life and death,) we leave to an equall judgement. Or, if you intended not to extend your assimilation of them

them so far as may be drawn from your words, yet who sees not, that he shews little holiness, and charity in his railing and deriding Epistle against *Stephen*? and so could not be esteemed by *St. Augustin* a most holy and charitable Bishop, as *St. Cyprian* was; and that he condemned *Stephen* for a Schismaticque, as you grant, and for an Heritique; and so could not be all the time of his error in Catholique Communion with *Stephen*, as *St. Cyprian* was, (according to *St. Augustin*.) Though therefore you intend this Identitie of their case in regard of their error, onely in relation to their words, yet seeing you put no other cause of the infringing the authority of them, (and in your former misconception impose upon your Reader, that we put no other also) save onely their being in the same error; your constituting them both in the same case, in regard of that error, makes so much for you, that what soever *Firmilian* writ in relation to that error, will be of as great authority, as any thing that *St. Cyprian* writ in reference to it: which were it true, would be a great advantage to your cause, and might

might prove as disadvantageous to our cause, as it is contrary to our words. You say here, *that favouring of Rebaptization was the onely thing alledged against the authority of the words of Firmilian*; which follows indeed from your misconception, but not from our words: For we affirm, that the being transported with passion and impetuosity, (which we call *aliquid humanum*) was another and more immediate cause of infringing the authority of his words; and therefore we say, (having premised the mentioning of that his passionate writing) *and in this condition, &c.* which we refer as well to his Passion, as to his Error; (and you by another new Misconceit understand here as related to his sole Errour) so that though with you and before you we constituted that error as a cause of diminishing the authority of his words; yet we neither before you, nor with you ever affirmed, that the said error was the total and onely cause of infringing it. For it is evident, that not onely error in Doctrine, but immoderate Passion in speaking or writing against ones adversary, infringes the authority of the words, which  
are

are so written or spoken. What you further say, that it imported nothing to your cause, to make them alike in all things in relation to their error, we answer, that we have already seen, how much you endeavoured to advantage your cause by it; yet this would not (we suppose) induce you to assimilate them in matters, which you your self, when you seriously ponder it, cannot judge but improbable; as that *Firmilian* was lesse imperiously carried towards his error all the time he stuck to it, then was *St. Cyprian*, because he repented him of it, and revoked it; and it is not certain, that ever *St. Cyprian* revoked his. For first, *St. Cyprian* was very shortly after the celebration of the Council of *Carthage*, taken up to heaven by a most blessed and glorious Martyrdome, before this question of Rebaptization was throughly ventilated. For he celebrated that Council *Anno* 258. and he suffered *Anno* 261. But *Firmilian* lived many years after for he was in the Council of *Antioch* against *Paulus Samosatenus*, *Anno* 266. according to *Baronius*; and so had more time to examine that question, and to see how the

the other Bishops stood affected in regard of it. And seeing both those of *Africa* and the East discovered and acknowledged their errour, he also joyned himself to them. It was not therefore that *Firmilian* was lesse earnest for a time in it, and haply longer then St. *Cyprian*, but that he had more time and experience about it, to discover the deceit of it, which had St. *Cyprian* had, (as Saint *Augustin* often pronounceth of him) who can doubt, but he would presently have deserted it? And secondly, is it not very possible, that one may be more earnestly and passionately set upon a perswasion, for the time he adheres to it, though he after, upon better information, desert it, then another, who staies longer, or alwaies in it, for want of the like information?

The next misconception, which we lay to your charge is holding *Firmilian* alwayes (even whilest he held Rebaptization, writ so bitterly against *Stephen*, and remained for a time under excommunication) a holy Bishop. This notwithstanding by all means you endeavour to make good, and seem to be not a little



little offended with us for asserting the contrary. And indeed had we invented our Accusations against *Firmilian*, for the time he angered us by avowing, that unjust ejection of others out of the Church, as such, is Schisme; and that in case we should not be able to defend very well this our accusation, we shall have committed a criminall calumny against *Firmilian*, that our undertaken Opinion, Definition and Sentence may not be impeacht, which *Firmilian* so irreconcileably contradicts; as though indeed nothing but spite and envy against *Firmilian*, had moved us groundlessly to invent this our Accusation against him: had we indeed done this, as you lay it to our charge, you might have deservedly been offended with us. But truly we have reason to esteem this censure very hard, especially issuing from you, whilest you pretend to stand for charity, and when you can neither be ignorant your selves, nor suppose us to be, that the very same Accusations, which we frame against *Firmilian*, were pressed against him, many a fair year, before any one could dream, you would urge an Argument from his words, by the most eminent  
Cardi-

Cardinals *Baronius* and *Peron. Barcn.*  
*Anno 258. Peron. lib. 1. c. 25. cont. reg.*  
*Jacob. Translat. Anglican.*

You say, our Acculation is unground-  
 ed, both because it is neither certain, that  
 he was excommunicated by *Stephen*; or  
 if he were excommunicated, that he was  
 faulty in resisting that excommunication,  
 which seemed unto him unjust, as the ex-  
 communications of the Pope may be;  
 and it appears not, that this was not un-  
 just. To these two heads we answer; to  
 the first, that your Argument drawn from  
*Firmilians* words supposes those of the  
 East to have been excommunicated by  
*Stephen*; and there is no reason to judge,  
 that any were so, if *Firmilian* and those  
 of *Cappadocia* were not. For *Stephen*  
 threatens, at least by letters particularly  
 directed to them, to excommunicate them  
 for that error, *Enseb. lib. 7. Histor. c. 4.*  
 This therefore we thought so clear even  
 to you, that it needed no proving; and  
 yet because you stand upon it, we shall  
 have occasion to prove it more fully here-  
 after. To the second, we reply, that  
 though it were supposed, that the Pope  
 himself might excommunicate others un-  
 justly,

justly, as certainly he may do *in materia facti*, yet there is no reason to think, that this Excommunication inflicted by *Stephen* was unjust; both because Saint *Augustin* (as we shall presently see) affirms, that *Stephen* alwayes remained in Catholique Communion; and that he executed his Office *illibate*; and that these excommunicated Bishops were received again into favour by him, by the intercession of *Dionysius Alexandrinus* for them, when they repented them of their error.

To your example of *Victor*, and those of the East, we say, That if any of them remained wilfully under that excommunication, they were not esteemed holy Bishops by *Irenaeus*.

To that of the *tria Capitula*, we say, that it was no matter of Faith, which was there handled; that there appears no ground to affirm, that *Vigilius* excommunicated the Fathers of that Council for condemning the *Tria Capitula*, or that they fell into any excommunication in condemning them. And lastly, that the fifth Council, consisting almost of none but Eastern Bishops, they not expecting

pecting those of the West. which were to come to it, (as was agreed betwixt *Vigilius* and *Iustinianus*) and being celebrated without and against the will of *Vigilius*, was then no lawfull œcumenical Council, when it condemned the *Tria Capitula*.

Your telling of us in the next Paragraph, what you think of the Popes Excommunications, &c. as it was needless, because we could sufficiently guesse, that such were your thoughts, without your telling us; so was it useles to endeavor to move us or any one without proof: onely you lay some grounds in it, which Presbyterians and other Sectaries may lay hold of against you and your Bishops; and indeed every turbulent Novelist against such as are in actuall possession, and that of many hundred years quietly continued, of superiority over them.

We answer presly to the substance. That *Firmilian* first was excommunicated by Pope *Stephen*; which you say, (and we wonder you say so) we prove onely by the witnesse of the words that are found in *Eusebius*, lib. 7. *Histor. cap. 4*. For we after affirm, that some for holding peremptorily that error (to wit, of Rebaptization)

were

were excommunicated by him, (Stephen) viz. those of the East; and amongst the rest, as we have said, Firmilian; which is sufficiently proved by the words of Firmilian cited by you: for if none were excommunicated by Stephen, your Argument falls to the ground; which was to prove by the authority of *Firmilian*, that Stephen was a Scismaticque, and cut off from the Church, by an unjust cutting off, abstaining, or excommunicating others: and if any were excommunicated by him, it was those of the East, (for those of *Africa* were not) and if those of the East, certainly *Firmilian*; for all may be exempted from it as well as he; and by his uncharitable and contumelious expressions against Stephen, he seems to deserve it in the first place, viz. in comparing him to *Judas*, saying, he was worse then the very Heretiques themselves, taunting and flouting at him, exclaiming and railing against him, &c.

To the place of *Eusebius*, first, supposing that you must acknowledge, that those of the East were excommunicated by Stephen, as your Argument requires; and that *Firmilians* words cited by you  
to

to that purpose, affirm it to be true, you must also acknowledge, that the words of *Stephen* here cited by *Eusebius*, ἡ κοινὴν-σων, must in effect signifie an excommunication from a Superiour: and that *Stephen* by that expression (which we shall more largely examine, if we come to treat the Popes supremacy) meant, that he, and with him the whole Catholique Church which adhered to him, would deny them their Communion; which in effect is, to exclude them from Communion with them, or to excommunicate them.

Secondly, admitting (not granting) that those words were a threat of excommunicating, and not an actuall excommunication, yet (as you know) such a threat, by way of Canonical admonition, if the person threatned persist in the cause of that intimated excommunication, he effectually incurs the censure, as those of the East did, by too peremptory a continuance in the Rebaptization of Heretiques, in contempt and execration of the authority of *Stephen* and his See.

Thirdly, supposing that some were excommunicated by *Stephen*, (as you contend,

tend, and we grant) and that there are no other words extant in Antiquity, written by *Stephen*, whereby he inflicted that Excommunication upon them, save those here related by *Eusebius*, (for where are any other? and that the reason given of those words is not any thing future, but what was done before, and then actually practised; to wit, their rebaptizing Heretiques, it is necessary to say, that those words *καὶ κοινοῦντων*, not communicating hereafter, are a declaration of his actuall will and resolution, and not a threat for the future onely, that from that time when he wrote that Epistle, he would communicate no more with them, but leave them as excommunicated persons. For this *καὶ κοινοῦντων*, being in the Participle, signified more emphatically, that he would be thenceforth no more communicating, or a Communicatour with them, then if it had been expressed in the future tense of the verb. Lastly, that by this *ἐπιτιμῶν*, is meant an Act of Jurisdiction of a superiour to a subject, is here manifest out of the words of *Dionysius Alexandrinus*. For after he had recited those words



words of *Stephen*, and named *Firmilian*, with many others, he addes, *Atque ut pro his omnibus Episcopis illum deprecarer, Epistolam scripsi*: And I wrote an Epistle to him (*Stephen*) to deprecate him, or to crave pardon for all those Bishops: where he useth the word *δέμωος*, which signifies to supplicate out of the necessity which one hath of the aid of another, to whom he supplicates. Now such a deprecation for another could not be prudently made to *Stephen*, but as to a superiour for a subject. For it must either be made as to a friend, or as to a judge and superiour. Now *Dionysius Alexandrin.* could not make this deprecation for those Bishops to *Stephen* as to a friend of them; for *Stephen* was highly offended with them for their opposition made and maintained against him. Therefore it must have been made as to a Judge and Superiour, who had power to pardon those, whom he had punished.

Now to shew, that the words *ἐκ κοινωνισμῶν*, spoken in Greek by *Eusebius*, signified in those Primitive times as much as to excommunicate, (which you here deny) I will produce some instances, which for

the present may suffice to confirm that acception. It is manifest, that *Victor* excommunicated (even as you have proved) the Eastern Bishops for the observation of Easter with the Jews; and it is as certain, that the Predecessours of *Victor* (as *St. Irenæus* affirms) excommunicated them not. Now *St. Irenæus* proves that they were retained in the Communion of the Church by those former Popes, because they sent to them the most holy Eucharist: whereby they signified, that they communicated with them. Whence may be rightly inferred, that to whomsoever the Ancient Bishops of *Rome* refused to send the Eucharist, which was the seal and signet of their Communion with others, they refused them their Communion; and thereby signified, that they were deprived of the Communion of the Catholique Church, or excommunicated. For if the sending of the Eucharist were a testimony of the Bishop of *Rome's* Communion with others, and the Communion of the Bishop of *Rome* with others a certification of their being in the Communion of the Catholique Church; the refusing to send it was a depriving

priving them of his Communion; and the depriving of his Communion an assurance, that no Catholique Prelate was to communicate with them; which is nothing but Excommunication. Secondly, the same truth is manifestly confirmed by the examples following. *Eulalius* Bishop of *Syracusa*, dissuading *St. Fulgentius* from going into *Egypt* sayes, *The Countries, whither thou desirest to travell, a perfidious dissention hath separated them from the Communion of blessed Peter; those religious persons, whose admirable abstinence is celebrated, should not have the Sacraments of the Altar common with thee.* Where he thinks it unlawfull for *Saint Fulgentius* (and the same is of all other Catholiques) to communicate with those, who were separated from the Sea of *Peter*. *Author vite Fulgentii.* And *John Patriarch* of *Constantinople*; We promise not to recite amongst the sacred *Mysteries*, the names of those who are separated from the Communion of the Catholique Church; that is to say, who do not fully consent with the Sea Apostolique. *Joan. Patriarch. Constantinop. Epist. ad Hormisdam. Tom. 2. Concil. Cap. 1.*

Tit. 1. Libr. 7. And *Menas* also Patriarch of Constantinople. *We follow the Sea Apostolique, and obey it; and communicate with those that communicate therewith, and condemn those that it condemneth, Concil. Constantinop. sub Mena. Act. 4.* And the Bishops returning from Schism, in St. Gregory the Great's time, subscribed thus. *I. A. B. do promise, that I will never return to the Schisme, from whence by the Grace and Mercy of our Redeemer I have been delivered; but that I will remain alwayes in the unity of the Catholique Church, and in the Communion of the Bishop of Rome. Gregor. magn. libr. 10. Indict. 5. epist. 31. St. Hierome ad Damasum epist. 57. I am joyned with thy Blessedness, that is to say, with the Sea of Peter. I know the Church is founded upon that rock, &c. Whosoever eateth the Lamb out of this house is profane. And a little after. If any one be joyned to Peters Chair, he is mine. Optat. Milevit. contra Parmenian. libr. 2. At Rome there hath been settled to Peter the Episcopall Chair; in which there was set the first of all the Apostles Peter, &c. to the end, that in this onely Chair the unity of all might be*

*be preserved.* And a little after. *In the person of Syricius all the world communicates with us, by the commerce of formed letters.* Whence appears clearly, that to communicate with the Bishop of Rome and with the Catholique Church were ancient *Synonima's* : and so by the rule of Contraries, not to communicate with him, was to be out of the Communion of the Catholique Church.

And hence appears secondly, that the Excommunication of *Stephen*, supposed to have been inflicted upon *Firmilian* was just and lawfull. For otherwise *Dionys. Alexand.* (a holy and just Prelate) would not have craved pardon and favour for them from *Stephen*, but have defended them, and condemned *Stephen* for having unjustly Excommunicated them. Whence followes, that whatsoever may be said of the possibility in the Pope to Excommunicate others unjustly, (which you press a little after, and thereby divert the question to another new difficulty) yet this particular Excommunication of those Eastern Bishops by *Stephen*, was not *de facto* unjust : both because *Dionysius Alexandrinus* acknowledged the justice of it, when

he deprecated, or craved pardon of *Stephen* for them; and because the whole sway and Body of the Catholique Church, and the incomparable greater and chiefer number of Bishops (as *Saint Augustin* affirms, hereafter to be cited) remained constantly adhering to *Stephen*, and communicating with him, even after that Excommunication: which shews evidently, that they esteemed him no Schismaticque. For they knew well enough it was unlawful to communicate with Schismaticques; and consequently (according to your *Tenet*) that his Excommunication was not unjust.

What you press also from these words *as 'ed's*, as likewise (as you say) or rather *as neither*, that they must have reference to the Bishops of *Africa*, brings with it no necessary consequence of referring them to the Bishops of *Africa*, as you infer from them to prove them a threat onely. For *Dionysius Alexandrinus* here both speaks of the Heresie of *Donatus*, (or *Donatianns*, as *Eusebius* sayes) being refused by those Bishops, and of those, who rebaptized Heretiques. Now it may be, that *Stephen* excommunicated the one as well as the other: and  
so

so 'is 'use' may be referred to them; that as he excommunicated the one for following *Donatianus*, or *Donatus*, so he excommunicated the other for rebaptizing Heretiques: or if in that Epistle he excommunicated onely those who rebaptized, we answer, that he speaks there of divers other distant Nations and Cities, as of *Syria*, *Arabia*, *Antioch*, &c. and the bordering Nations to them, as well as those of *Cappadocia*, *Cilicia*, and *Galatia*, to whom onely he wrote the Epistle; to which Bishops, as being involved in the same error, those words 'as 'use' may be referred; and so have no necessary relation to those of *Africa*.

And hence also appears, why those of the East are rather to be thought excommunicated by *Stephen*, then those of *Africa*: because in this cited Epistle there are words which signifie an actuall Excommunication, as we have shewed, and not a bare threat of it, when the other were onely threatened. Secondly, *Firmilian* signifies in his Epistle to St. *Cyprian*, that *Stephen* refused their Legates, not onely Communion, but lodging, and as *Firmilian* saith, *breaking peace*



*with them.* Thirdly, those of the East pretended (as *Firmilian* affirms) not only that Rebaptization was a truth drawn from Scriptures, &c. but that it was an Apostolicall tradition, come down from the very Apostles to them: and that the other of *Stephen* was a meer humane tradition. Fourthly, those of the East long before had concluded Rebaptization in a Councell at *Iconium*. Fifthly, those of the East *de facto*, did rebaptize, and had a common custome to do so for many years: whereas those of *Africa* of *St. Cyprians* party did not bring it into common practice before the fourth Councell of *Carthage* at least, where it was more fully concluded: For *St. Cyprian* sent the Acts of the precedent Council to *Stephen* to have his approbation of them; and so would not certainly determine any contrary practice to what was accustomed before he received *Stephens* answer: No, nor then neither, (it being *negative*, and against those decrees,) till he had assembled another Councell, as he did. And even after that, I would gladly have some Testimony in Antiquity, that those Bishops actually

actually and commonly Rebaptized others: especially the persecution presently beginning again; and those Bishops not long after revoking their sentences, and conforming themselves to *Stephen*, as *St. Hierome contr. Luciferian*. witnesses. Therefore you rather suppose then prove, that they both were guilty alike of Rebaptization. Sixthly, because those of *Cappadocia*, and the rest of the East, siding with *Firmilian*, stood in open defiance of *Stephens* Authority, as *Firmilian* the chief leader and of greatest authority among them did; and so defended that Errour with pertinacy and obstinacy for a time; whilest the peaceable *St. Cyprian* and the Bishops of *Africa* under him, and lead by his example and Doctrine, behaved themselves with a Spirit of Unity, and desired nothing more then to live in Communion and Christian correspondence with *Stephen*, as appears by *St. Cyprians* sending the Decrees of a former Council of *Carthage* to *Stephen*, desiring his approbation of them, and hoping to obtain it; and by *St. Augustins* Authority (to be cited presently) who affirms that *Stephen* and *St. Cyprian*

lived alwayes in peace and Unity together.

You signifie more then once, that the testimony which you bring from *Firmilians* words in confirmation of your assertion and definition (supposing his Authority, and continuall Catholique Sanctity can be proved, which you endeavour) is wholly unanswerable; and would have your hearers believe, that we hold it so. Now we never yet determined, much lesse confessed any such matter; because we thought it not worth the answering, as being spoken in passion and error; and so esteemed it rather to be rejected or silenced, then examined or directly answered. Yet since you stick so much upon it, we will afford a word of Answer to it; and briefly shew, that it is not so convincing against us, as you imagine. *Firmilian* therefore in that Epistle framed two main Accusations against *Stephen*. The one, that by participating (as he thought) with Heretiques in Baptisme, he himself fell into the same state with Heretiques, which is manifest by those words, *Num. 4. Ceteros quique Hareticos constat praevaris*  
*suas*

*suas sectas & inventiones perversas, prout quisque errore ductus est, postea induxisse; quos omnes manifestum est à semetipsis damnatos esse, & ante diem iudicii inexcusabilem sententiam adversus semetipsos dixisse: Quorum Baptisma qui confirmat, quid aliud, quàm cum ipsis se adjudicat, & seipsum participem talibus faciendo, condemnat.* “It is evident, saith he, that  
 “the rest of Heretiques introduced their  
 “evill sects and perverse opinions, accordingly as each of them was seduced  
 “by error. All which, it is manifest, that they are condemned of themselves,  
 “and have pronounced before the day of Judgement an inexcusable sentence  
 “against themselves: whose Baptism who-soever confirms, what does he, but  
 “judge himself with them, and condemns himself by making himself partaker  
 “with such. And Num. 20. *Quando enim Baptismo Hereticorum communicas, quid aliud quàm devoragine & cæno eorum bibis? & ipse Ecclesie sanctificatione purgatus, alienarum sordium tactibus inquinaris?* “For when thou communicatest with the Baptisme of Heretiques,  
 “what dost thou but drink of their gulf  
 and

“ and mud? and thou having been pur-  
 “ ged by the Lavacre, or washing, of the  
 “ Church, art defiled with the touch of  
 “ others wickednesse? Secondly, he ac-  
 cuses him of breeding dissentions and dis-  
 cords in the Church, saying, *Lites enim*  
*& dissensiones quantas parasti per Eccle-*  
*sias totius mundi?* How many strifes,  
 saith he, and contentions hast thou caused  
 through the Churches of the whole  
 world? And Num. 25. *Quid enim hu-*  
*milis aut lenius, quàm cum tot Episcopis*  
*per totum mundum dissensisse, pacem cum*  
*singulis vario discordie genere rumpentem,*  
*&c.* For what is there more humble and  
 meek, saith he, in an Ironical manner,  
 then to dissent from so many Bishops  
 through the whole world, breaking with  
 each one of them peace by different kinds  
 of discord. These two capitall accusati-  
 ons supposed, he thunders against Stephen  
 those words which you first cited, and  
 wherein you placed the strength of your  
 argument, viz. *Peccatum verò magnum ti-*  
*bi exaggerasti, quando te à t. gregibus sci-*  
*disti: exscidisti enim te ipsum; noli te fallere.*  
*Siquidem ille est vere Schismaticus, qui se*  
*à Communione Ecclesiastica unitatis Apo-*  
*statum.*

“ *statam fecit.* Thou hast committed a  
 “ great sin, when thou didst cut thy self  
 “ off from so many flocks. For, deceive not  
 “ thy self, thou hast cut thy self off. For  
 “ he is truly a Schismaticque, who hath  
 “ made himself an Apostate from the  
 “ Communion of the Ecclesiasticall  
 “ Unity.

Now who sees not, that all these words  
 may be applied to the first accusation,  
*viz.* that he cut himself off from the Ec-  
 clesiasticall Unity, by uniting and defiling  
 himselfe in his Communion with Here-  
 tiques, in approving their Baptisme? And  
 if this can be so applied (and we desire to  
 know the reason, why it cannot,) the  
 whole force of your Argument is evacu-  
 ated: which you placed in these words,  
*viz. Dum enim putas omnes à te abstinere posse, solum te ab omnibus abstinuisti.*  
 “ For whilest thou thinkest, that thou art  
 “ able to abstain, or excommunicate all  
 “ from thee, thou hast onely abstained  
 “ thy self from all, are as applyable to the  
 first accusation, as the former. For here  
 he saith not, (as you make him say to  
 speak for you) *Abstinendo omnes, teipsum*  
*ab omnibus abstinuisti;* by abstaining (that  
 is

is, excommunicating) all, thou hast abstained thy self from all; which would have been a causall, and made for you: but *Dum enim putas omnes à te abstinere posse, &c.* Whilest thou thinkest thou art able to abstain all from thee by Excommunication, thou abstainest thy self from all, to wit, by participating with Heretiques in the approbation of their Baptisme; whereby as *Firmilian* had said before, *Stephen* had put himself in the same state and condition with them; and thereby cut himself off from the Church. Seeing therefore *Firmilian* saith not expressly, that by actuall Excommunication of others, he separated himself from the Church, but whiles he thought he was able to abstain others, he abstained himself; and saith expressly, that by approving the Baptisme of Heretiques, he became a condemner of himself, which is proper to Heretiques, as both *St. Paul* and *Firmilian* say, and so separated himself from the Church, as all Heretiques do, it is not onely not necessary to apply these words to his actuall excommunicating unjustly (as you suppose) others; but much more connaturally and necessaritly to his approving Heretiques.



*Heretiques Baptism*; whereby he expressly affirmed, he was separated with them in participating with them: which solution either convinces your Argument of nullity, or at least abates its force, and questions its probability; and so shews it not to be (*even confessedly by us*, as you ungroundedly say) so unanswerable as you esteem it. To omit, that though it could be (which we deny) evidently collected hence, that *Firmilian* was of opinion, that by unjust excommunication of others, one came to separate themselves from the Church, yet this would be, in your opinion, from the company of the *lively members of Christ onely*, which is not the visible Church. And if it were understood of the visible Church, as *Firmilian* understands it, yet it would be onely causally, or efficiently, and not *formally*; which you were to have proved from it: seeing you brought it to overthrow our definition of Schisme, which must be understood to speak of Schisme formally, or in its intrinsecall notion and nature. For *Firmilian* puts the formall Nation, or Quiddity of Schisme, in the equivalent termes of our Definition, in the next pre-

precedent words, viz. *Ille est vere Schismaticus, qui se à Communionē Ecclesiasticæ unitatis Apostatam fecit.* "He is truly a Schismaticque, who hath made himself an Apostate from the Ecclesiasticall Unity,

Hence you proceed to a vindication of *Firmilian*, by a repetition something more large, then what you said before; which we esteem already answered in substance. Secondly, you charge us very heavily with a great want of charity for saying, that *Firmilian* was *no holy Bishop*, whilst he stood for some time obstinately under the Excommunication of *Stephen*; which we have proved to be true; and so not contrary to charity. But had you considered how sparingly we spake of *Firmilian*, to that which the grave Authour *Baronius* saith of him, you would rather have judged that we spake charitably, then uncharitably of him. For (seeing you compell us to say more then we are willing) *Baronius Anno 198. num. 1, 2, 3.* saith, That beside his Excommunication and standing out against *Stephen*, he was a Schismaticque and an Heretique; and proves it from the words of his own Epistle.

Epistle to St. *Cyprian* Epist. 75. wherein he accuses the Roman Church of error, for celebrating Easter at another time, then those of the East and *Hierusalem*, that is, haply then those of the Jews, did, which was not then defended but by the *Quarto decimani*, who as *Baronius* affirms, Anno 198. cited, were then held Schismaticques and Heretiques; because the Councils gathered through the whole Church had defined against them; and it begun to be very dangerous, because the Montanists taught their observation to be necessary, condemning that of *Rome*, and the rest of the Church, as here *Firmilian* does; and because *Blastus* a Roman Priest, under the cloak of that practice, laboured covertly to bring in Judaisme. See *Pacian. Epist. ad Sempron. Euseb. lib. 5. Hist. cap. 22. Zozom. lib. 7. cap. 18. Tertul. de Praescript. cap. 53. Euseb. lib. 5. Histor. cap. 19.* To avoid all these eminent dangers, Pope *Victor* excommunicated all those Asian observers of Easter, and the Council of *Nice* confirmed his sentence by condemning them as Heretiques. Your challenge therefore to prove, that any ancient Author speaks ill of *Firmilian* in any

any thing (excepting onely his error of Rebaptization) was unnecessary: for he speaks ill enough in this other particular of himself. But all this while, we have just reason to wonder, that you lie so heavy upon us, for denying for a time the sanctity of *Firmilian*, when you yourselves charge Pope *Stephen*, not onely of the losse of Holinesse, but of the capitall crime of Schisme, (which how horridly great it is, Dr. *Hammond* hath already told you) and that onely upon the sole accusation of his professed enemy, (whilst he was in error and in passion against him) contrary to the Characters made of him by *Vincent Lerinenfis*, St. *Augustin*, and the very Donatists themselves, as we shall presently declare.

*Vincentius Lirinensis* therefore not only commends him, and that very highly, in the whole carriage of this businesse, as we have said; but gives him the title of *Sanctus*, Holy *Stephen*. St. *Augustin* lib. 5. cont. Donatist. cap. 25. excuses him equally from Schisme with St. *Cyprian*; where speaking of them both, though of contrary opinions he saith thus: *Vicit tamen pax Christi in cordibus eorum, ut in tali*

*tali disceptatione nullum in eis malum schismatis oriretur.* " Yet the peace of Christ " overcame, saith he, in their hearts ; that " in such a difference and contrariety of " opinions , no evil of Schisme rose be- "twixt them. But the peace of Christ could not have gat the victory in the heart of *Stephen* , if he had fallen into Schisme ; which is directly opposite to Christian peace, unity, and charity. Therefore *St. Augustin* thought that he fell not into Schisme at all ; though in the same place he say , that *Stephen* judged those Rebatiziers to be excommunicated. And that it may appear , that he speaks not onely of the person of *St. Cyprian*, with whom ( by reason he never excommunicated him ) *Stephen* had no Schisme ; *St. Augustin lib. de Baptismo cont. Petil. cap. 14.* explicates himself in these words, speaking of them both, *Multi cum ipso ( Stephano ) quidam cum isto ( Cypriano ) etiam sentiebant, utrique cum eis in unitate consistentes.* Where he extends this unity, or negation of Schisme, both to them , and those who adhered to them ; and as appears by his ensuing words , he proves from this, that the whole Church was in union,

union, that is, free from Schisme, notwithstanding these differences in *Stephens* and *St. Cyprians* time. The Donatists also acknowledged *Stephen* not onely to be a good man, but so worthy a Pope, that he administred the charge of his Popedom without blame, or most justly and carefully. This is witnessed by *St. Augustin* contr. *Petilian. cap. 14. cited. Sed volo, solvat mihi iste (Petilianus) questionem, quandoquidem cum Romana Ecclesiæ per ordinem commemoraret Episcopos, inter eos commemoravit & Stephanum, quos Episcopatum illibate gessisse confessus est, &c.* "But I would have, "saith *St. Augustin*, this man (*Petilian*) "to answer me a question; seeing that "he, when he reckoned up in order the "Bishops of the Roman Church, whom "he confessed to have administred their "Bishops office *illibate*, without blame "or blemish, amongst them he reckons "also *Stephen*. Which had not been true, had he so unjustly behaved himself in it, that he had become a Schismaticque, as you accuse him.

Beside, not onely in the Roman, but also (which is very rare in the western Martyrs)

Martyrs) in the Grecian Calendar, his day is put, and celebrated amongst them for a Blessed Martyr: and seeing it is nowhere recorded, that *Stephen* ever revoked his censure of Excommunication, till the excommunicated revoked their error, and craved reconciliation, it is manifest, that he never acknowledged himself to have done ill in it; and they acknowledged that he did well by submitting themselves. It will by this, I hope appear, which of us two had the most reason, and the least charity, in our charges made by us against *Firmilian*, and by you against *Stephen*.

\* *These words follow those p. 444. viz.*  
That you can alledge. *Immediately before C. 6.*

*These Lines which next follow, are spent in a sole repetition of what had been said, and cited before, and we answered.*

P. 6.

Concerning *Firmilian*, first, hear we what his enemies yield him. See *Baronius ad Annum 258. Num. 47. Doctrinâ & sanctitudine morum nulli prope modum illorum temporum videbatur esse secundus:*

Eum



Eum Græci colunt ac venerantur; cujus natalem diem perinde ac aliorum Sancto-  
rum in Menologio consignatum, anniver-  
sariâ memoriâ celebrant. *That he seemed  
to be second to none almost of that Age in  
learning and holiness of manners; and that  
the Greeks do venerate and reverence him,  
keeping his Anniversary day, as of other  
Saints.*

*See also what Pamelius sayes of him,  
pag. 242. in St. Cyprians Edition.*

*See next (and rather) what St. Basil  
the Great saith of him, lib. de Spiritu  
Sancto, cap. 29. Τάύτην καὶ φερμιλιανῶ τῷ  
ἡμετέρῳ μαρτυρεῖσιν τὴν πίσιν οἱ λόγοι ὅς κατέ-  
λιπεν..... καὶ Καππαδοκίᾳ δὲ ἔτῳ λέγομεν  
ἐγχορίως: & hunc cum aliis statim appel-  
lat ἄνδρας συλῆς τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐν πάσῃ  
γνώσει καὶ συνάμει πνεύματι & διαπρεπεῖς.....*

*That this same faith (saith St. Basil the  
Great) was in our Firmilian, his Homi-  
lies, which he hath left behinde him, doe  
testifie..... and we of Cappadocia (where  
St. Basil succeeded him in his Archbishoprick  
of Cefarea) do so speak of Firmilian, by  
a Tradition left ever since his time here  
in this place and countrey..... and then  
presently he records him amongst those men,  
which*

which were, (*said he*) Pillars of the Church, illustrious in all knowledge, and in all power of the Spirit.

*What the Eastern Bishops his contemporaries, as well as Countrey-men, who best knew him, say of him in Eusebius, lib. 7. cap. 1. alias 23, 24. consider we now. All the Bishops of the Catholique Council of Antioch gathered together to the condemnation of Paulus Samosatenus that Arch-Heretique ; συγχρόνησις πλείων ἑσὼν ἐπισκόπων συνόδος, there being gathered together a Synod of a very great number of Bishops, they thus write in their Synodical Epistle to Dionysius Bishop of Rome, and to Maximus Bishop of Alexandria, two Patriarchs absent.*

We sent also by Letter, and intreated many Bishops of them that live far off from *Antioch*, to have come to the curing of this deadly Doctrine, by name, *Dionysius* from *Alexandria*, and *Firmilianus* from *Cappadocia*, τῶν μακαρίων, blessed men, of happy memory (*as your Bishop Christopherson renders it*) οἱ δεῖσις τιμωμένοι, &c. This is that *Firmilian* (*said they*) who had before come twice hither, and condemned the innovated Doctrines

Doctrines brought in by him, (*Paulus Samosatenus*) as we know, and do testifie, that then were present, and many others know: And when *Paulus* promised that he would be another man, *Firmilian* believing and hoping so, dismiss the matter without any reviling, or contumely put upon *Paulus* for it..... The same *Firmilianus* was now in coming unto us to *Antioch*, as who had had experience of his wicked Hereſie, that denies God, and was come as far as *Tarsus*, but while we were assembled, and called, and waited till he came, he died in his journey at *Tarsus*. *Eusebins himself. libro. 7. cap. 28.*

Inter Episcopos Synodi Antiochenæ, οἱ μάλιστα διέτρεπον φερμιλιανὸς μὲν τῆς Καππαδοκῶν καισαρείας ἐπίσκοπος ἦν, καὶ ἕλινθ, &c. Ἰούτων δὲ μάλιστα ἐπιφανεῖς ὅδε ἦσαν.

Amongst the Bishops of the Synod of *Antioch*, those which were most illustrious, were *Firmilianus* Bishop of *Cesarea*, of *Cappadocia*, and *Helenus*: and of those Bishops these were the most renowned.

In the Greek Leiturgie used unto this day in their Publique Service of God, Βιβλίον τῆς Ὀκτωβρίου μὴν, Octob. 28.

On

On that day we remember, ὁ ἅγιος πα-  
 τὴρ ἡμῶν φερμιλιανῶ, our holy Father  
*Firmilianus* Bishop of *Cesarea*, and *Mel-*  
*chion*, &c. which pulled down *Paulus*  
*Samosatensis*.

Ἐιρηνικῶς συνήκκετιν εἰρήνης τέκνα  
 φερμιλιανὸς καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ Μελχίων.

Peaceably do rest the Children of peace,  
*Firmilian*, and with him *Melchion*.

Thus the Greek Service-Book. Now  
 although you grant *Firmilian* dyed a Ca-  
 tholique Bishop, yet since you are not able  
 to bring any thing to disparage him, from  
 any but from your selves, or your own party,  
 men of yesterday, as it were angry with  
 him, for telling Pope Stephen his fault;  
 not from any Antiquity, that once deny  
 him (as you are bold to do) to have been  
 still a holy Catholique Bishop, during the  
 while he continued in his Errour, any more  
 then *Cyprian*, to have continued a holy  
 Catholique Bishop still, while he continued  
 no lesse in the self-same Errour. Antiquity  
 therefore by us produced must be heard,  
 speaking of him all good and honourable  
 Y things,

482      *The second and third, &c.*

*things, and no evil at all, or errour not common to him with the still holy Catholique Bishop Cyprian. Therefore, as no Catholique dares reject St. Cyprians Authority concerning the Bishop of Romes power, or his judgement, what was Schisme (though spoken then :) no more may ye reject Firmilians.*

---

SECT.

## S E C T. 4.

¶ *The fourth Misconceit made good against our Adversaries.*

## C. 7.

FOurthly, you misconceive the words of St. *Cyprian*, which we compare with those of *Firmilian*. For they were not those words which you cite, spoken by St. *Cyprian* in the Councell of *Carthage*, (wherein nothing at all is spoken against *Stephen*, as we shall shew presently) but the words which he wrote expressly against him in one of his Epistles. And this to be our meaning is evident; because we say, they were those words, whereof St. *Augustin* sayes, that St. *Cyprian* *patiebatur aliquid humani* in the writing of them: which are not those words spoken by St. *Cyprian* in the Councell: for St. *Augustin*, as you cite him, and that truly, allowed of *them*, and commended *them*, but those which he wrote against *Stephen* in his Epistle, at which St. *Augustin* was so much offend-

X 2

ed,

484. *The fourth Misconceit discovered.*  
ed, and did so much dislike of them, that  
he saith, *libr. 5. contr. Donatist. cap 25.*  
*The things which Cyprian spread in anger*  
*against Stephen, I will not let them passe*  
*under my pen.*

P. 8.

*The next Misconceit objected to us is,*  
*touching what words of St. Cyprian you*  
*then intended to compare with those of Fir-*  
*milian: which since then you named not,*  
*you may now say what you please, and so*  
*escape confuting: onely thus much we shall*  
*say, that whereas you even then professed to*  
*compare with the words of Firmilian, the*  
*like words of St. Cyprian against the same*  
*Stephen, while he (i.e. St. Cyprian) fa-*  
*voured the same error of Rebaptization,*  
*we are sure the words of St. Cyprian,*  
*which were by us cited, and as you acknow-*  
*ledge, by St Augustin commended, are as*  
*like words, and more like to Firmilians*  
*words, and spoken against the same Stephen,*  
*and whilest he favoured the same error of*  
*Rebaptization, as are those words, which*  
*you now relate unto. And although to*  
*prevent this probable understanding of your*  
*sense then, you are now pleased to say, that*  
*the words of St. Cyprian by us cited, were*  
*nothing*



*The fourth Misconceit discovered. 485*  
*nothing at all spoken against Stephen, and*  
*that you promise to shew presently; so pre-*  
*sently as you shall come to shew it, we will*  
*shew the contrary, and prove they were spo-*  
*ken against Stephen: and then if this we*  
*prove, you who acknowledge these words by*  
*as cited out of Cyprian in the Councell of*  
*Carthage, to have been commended by St.*  
*Augustin, must acknowledge, that the*  
*words (and those we will shew to be like*  
*words unto Firmilians) spoken by St. Cy-*  
*prian against Stephen, were commended by*  
*St. Augustin. And as to those very words*  
*of St. Cyprian, which you acknowledge he*  
*wrote against Stephen in his Epistle, where-*  
*as you say, that St. Augustin was so much*  
*offended at them, and did so much dislike*  
*them, that he saith, libr. 5. contr. Dona-*  
*tist. cap. 25. The things which Cyprian*  
*spread in anger against Stephen, I will not*  
*let them pass under my pen; (So you tran-*  
*slate St. Augustins words, that you may*  
*transfer the blame :) we now shall shew,*  
*this your Translation injurious to St. Au-*  
*gustin, and to St. Cyprian (as before you*  
*have been injurious to Firmilian.) St. Au-*  
*gustins words in that place cited by you are*  
*these. Jam illa, quæ in Stephanum irrita-*

486 *The fourth Misconceit discovered.*

tus effudit (*Cyprianns*) retractare nolo : quia & non opus est ; eadem quippe ipsa dicuntur , quæ jam satis discussa sunt. *Which you will now acknowledge ( we believe ) to be rightly rendered thus ;* Now those things which *Cyprian* being provoked, spread (*if you will*) against *Stephen*, I will not handle again ; forasmuch as the same things are therein said ; which have been already discussed. *What St. Augustin saith, irritatus, Cyprian being provoked, ( casting the blame upon the provocation given by Stephen ) you read Cyprian in anger ( blaming Cyprians passion ; ) And what St. Augustin saith , Retractare nolo, quippe jam discussa ;* I will not handle again, as which have been already discussed. *You read, I will not let them passe under my pen ; putting St. Augustin, according to your own passion , into a fit of indignation against Cyprians words, in those words, Retractare nolo, which may well deserve your own retraction.*

C. 8.

Your fourth Misconceit, in the words of *St. Cyprian* mentioned by us , you cannot avoid. For we determined in our first relation of them , ( as appears in our  
an-

answer) that they were those, in which *St. Augustin* affirms, *St. Cyprian* shewed some humane frailty of immoderate vehemency, and not those which he commends to be full of peace and charity, which you cite. Now this Misconceit touches not the matter, or meaning of those words cited by you, whether they were meant of *Stephen* or no; but whether they were the words, whereof *St. Augustin* affirms that *St. Cyprian* did suffer *aliquid humani*; which we onely pointed at, (as appears by our words) and which it is evident they are not. Answer, we pray you, presly to this.

Concerning the words, which we cite in English out of *St. Augustin*, pronounced upon those things, which *Saint Cyprian* writ against *Stephen* in his Epistle to *Pompeius*, *The things which Cyprian spread in anger against Stephen, I will not let them pass under my pen; lib. 5. contra Donatist. cap. 25.* Because we say, that *St. Augustin* was so much offended at them, and disliked them, that he passed this censure, thus expressed by us of them, you pass this censure upon us, viz. *That we so translate St. Augustins words, that we may transfer the blame,*

488 *The fourth Misconceit discovered.*

and that you will shew this our translation to be injurious to St. Augustin and St. Cyprian, as before we have been injurious to Firmilian. A hard censure! which impeaches not onely our credit and sincerity in citing and translating Authours, but questions that of the most eminent and most learned Cardinall Peron, and his Translation into English. And therefore not so much for our own, as for the just defence of his unblemish't credit, we are put upon a necessity of vindicating our Translation from every, the least shadow or appearance of deserving so harsh and rash a censure. First therefore, that it may undeniably appear, that this English Translation of St. *Augustins* words was not invented and framed, much lesse of set purpose coyned (as you seem to insinuate) and advantageously couched by us, it is the very same word for word which we found made to our hands, in the English Translation of *Peron*, as any one may see, who shall please to peruse the place. Now for the Translation it self. The words of St. *Augustin* in Latine are these, *ſam illa, quæ in Stephanum irritatus effudit, (Cyprianus) retractare nolo, quia &*

non

*non opus est; eadem quippe ipsa dicuntur, quæ jam satis discussa sunt; & ea præterire melius est; quæ periculum perniciose dissensionis habuerunt.* The English translation of the first words of this Latine sentence given by us, was this; *The things which Cyprian spread in anger against Stephen, I will not let them passe under my pen.* You argue our Translation of dissonancy from St. Augustins latine words, thus; *What St. Augustin saith irritatus, Cyprian being provoked, (casting the blame upon the provocation given by Stephen) you read Cyprian in anger, blaming Cyprians passion; and what St. Augustin saith, Retractare nolo, quippe jam discussa; I will not handle again, as which have been already discussed.* You read, *I will not let them passe under my pen; putting St. Augustin, according to your own passion into a fit of indignation against St. Cyprians words, in those words, retractare nolo, which may well deserve your own retraction.* Thus you. But we shall presently see, which of us deserves to retract the translation and citation of St. Augustins words, you or we. Concerning the word *irritatus*, according to Calepin,

490 *The fourth Misconceit discovered.*

*Thomas Thomafius*, Rider, Cooper, and Terence, it signifies as well *iratus*, angry, kindled to wrath, nettled, fired up to anger, moved to wrath, and the like, as simply provoked. What injury then is it, either to St. *Augustin*, or St. *Cyprian* to translate it in anger, that is, being moved to anger, or being angry. Now seeing *irritatus* is here joyned to *effundo* (*effudit*) which, sayes *Calepin*, signifies *extra spargo*, and others, a pouring out unmeasureably, especially being applied to words spoken, or written against another, whom we apprehend to have offended us; and being followed presently with this sentence in the same place of St. *Augustin*, *Quamvis commotius, tamen fraternè indignabatur*; where *commotius* signifies troubledly, or something too vehemently; coming from *commoveo*, which according to *Calepin* signifies *perturbo*, to trouble, or vex another; and applied to the word *indignor* (*indignabatur*) which *Calepin* renders *irascor*, *molestè fero*, I am angry, or molested; being we say, joyned to these words and sentences, must signifie here in anger, or angry.

Concerning the other words, *retracta-*

*The fourth Misconceit discovered.* 491

*re nolo, I will not, say we, let pass under my pen; to know groundedly, which is the right signification of these words in this place, we must consider, that St. Augustin in this fifth Book against the Donatists, examines certain chief passages in the Epistles of St Cyprian touching rebaptization, and was treating, when he wrote these words, his Epistle to Pompeius; wherein St. Cyprian utters some words against Stephen. So that this fifth Book was a retractating, or rehearsing of St. Cyprians Epistles, as appears by his running over the chief passages of them one after another. So that retractare here had no relation to any thing, which St. Augustin had treated before, but to the Epistles of St. Cyprian; of which he framed a tract, or rehearfall in this book; which he calls in other places pertractare: insomuch, that retractare is here as much as to treat again, or to handle anew the passages of St. Cyprians Epistles, which is as we translate it, to let the words of St. Cyprians Epistles pass under his pen by a new examination of them. When therefore he sayes retractare nolo, it is as much as to say, I will not take any particular notice*



492 *The fourth Misconceit discovered.*

notice of them, or make any particular reflexion upon them, by setting these words down *verbatim*, as I have done in the other passages of this Epistle: and therefore of those other passages, which he had already discussed, he sayes here, *Eadem quippe ipsa dicuntur*, for those very things themselves are rehearsed, that is, as they stand in St. Cyprians Epistle word for word. Whereby is cleared the truth and propriety of our translation. As touching the next following words, *Quia & nec opus est, eadem quippe ipsa dicuntur, quae jam satis discussa sunt*, (where you go no further in the sentence) that they may be consonant to the former and subsequent words, they are to be thus translated; *Because neither is it needfull; for those very things themselves, which are already discussed, dicuntur*, are mentioned, that is, cited *verbatim* by me (St. Augustin) as they stand in St. Cyprians Epistles. *Et ea praeferre melius est, quae periculum perniciose dissensionis habuerunt*, and it is better to pass by those things (that is without citing them *verbatim*) which contained the danger of a pernicious dissension. Thus the whole sentence

tence of St. *Augustin* will have a most full and congruous sense, viz. The things which he (*St. Cyprian*) spread, or vent-ed effusedly in anger, or being intensed against *Stephen*, I will not treat, or let passe under my pen: because it is not needfull. For those very things themselves, which are already discussed, are, or may be fitly mentioned, or rehearsed *verbatim* out of *St. Cyprian*, and it is better to passe by those (i. e. not citing the precise words) which contained the danger of a pernicious dissension. Now we appeal to the judicious Auditors, whether this and our former translation, is not free from either insincerity, or impropriety, or dissonancy from *St. Augustins* words and meaning. And thus we come to your citation and translation of *St. Augustins* words. You cite them thus. *Jam illa quæ in Stephanum irritatus effudit (Cyprianus) retractare nolo, quia & non opus est: eadem quippe ipsa dicuntur, quæ jam satis discussa sunt,* and there you stop. And then you translate them thus, *Now these things, which Cyprian being provoked spread against Stephen, I will not handle again, forasmuch as the same things are therein*

494 *The fourth Misconceit discovered*  
*therein said, which have been already dis-*  
*cussed.* Now I hope, licence will also be  
granted us, to frame our accusations  
against this your citation and translation:  
for we are so far from acknowledging,  
that St. *Augustins* words are rightly ren-  
dered by this your translation (as you say  
*you believe we will acknowledge*) that we  
esteem them a plain and evident perversi-  
on of his words and sense. First, there-  
fore you cite his words by halves, cutting  
them off in the midst, and making so  
obscure a sign that it was but part of the  
sentence, that it could scarce be percei-  
ved, and so leaving out the next insuing  
words of the sentence, which was to  
have given light to the whole sentence,  
*viz. Et ea praterire melius est, quae peri-*  
*culum perniciose dissensionis habuerunt.*  
Secondly, your translating *irritatus*, as it  
stands in this sentence, and context, one-  
ly simply *provoked*, unless you mean *pro-*  
*voked to anger*, or *incensed* (which you  
cannot mean, since you would thereby  
cast the whole blame upon *Stephen*, and  
free St. *Cyprian* from all defect and passi-  
on) is incongruous to the rest of the sen-  
tence.

tence. For it must have been such a provocation (which you admit not) that made him vent himself immoderately, or effuse his words against *Stephen*. Thirdly, you quite mistranslate those words, *Eadem quippe ipsa dicuntur, quæ jam satis discussa sunt*. For your translation supposes, that *St. Augustin* in some other place had treated before, and discussed those words, written by *St. Cyprian* against *Stephen*, which he never did, (and if he did, we press you to cite the place where) nor indeed could have done, unless you affirm, that he did that, which he himself here judges it was better not to have been done, or unfit to be done; *Et ea præterire melius est, quæ periculum perniciose dissensionis habuerunt*. For how could he judge, that it was fit to passe them over in silence, if he had discust them largely before? unlesse you judge, that he did that, which he thought not fit to be done; or to be better it had been left undone. And this incongruity would presently have appeared, if you had (as all fair dealing required) cited these last words of the sentence with the rest. For who can tell, what is the true meaning

496 *The fourth Misconceit discovered.*

meaning of the words of any sentence, unlesse he hear it all? We will therefore adjoyn this claule to the rest of the sentence, to your translation, and then leave it to the judgement of the Auditory, whether it hath, either truth or sense in it. Now, say you, *the things which Cyprian being provoked spread against Stephen, I will not handle again; forasmuch as the same things are (therein) said, which have been already discusſed; and it is better not to discusse those things, which contained the danger of a pernicious diffension.* Thus to excuse Cyprian from a humane passion you make St. *Augustin* ſpeak pure nonſenſe; we omit your adding the word *therein* (though in a Parenthesis) to the Latine Text: for by *therein* you muſt mean, (as we conceive) in those things, which St. *Cyprian* ſpoke againſt *Stephen*; which addition, as it makes the Text ſound for you, ſo it makes it your Text, not St. *Augustins*. For if it be lawfull to adde words of our own to a Translation of an Authour, even when the Controverſie is about that very addition, as it is here, any Tranſlatour may make his Author ſay what he pleaſes, to his purpoſe, and

and against his Adversary. We omit also here to tell you, that you have made an Abridgement of St. *Augustins* words in Latine, to make them serve your own turn, without any congruity to his words or meaning; and yet tell us, that they are St. *Augustins* words. For you say thus. What St. *Augustin* saith, *Retractare nolo, quippe jam discussa*: which as they, thus cited, speak plainly for you; so were they never said, as you affirm, by St. *Augustin*, but by you; and for your own advantage imposed upon him; and so are not his, but your words as they stand here. Neither will we tell you, that by concealing those last words of St. *Augustines* sentence, *Et ea melius est pretere-  
rire, qua periculum perniciosa dissensionis habuerunt*, you deprive your Auditors of the knowledge of St. *Augustins* dislike, and disapproving the words (which St. *Cyprian* there uttered against *Stephen*) in pronouncing of them, that they contained in them the danger of a pernicious dissenti<sup>n</sup>; and thereby both bore your Auditors in hand, that St. *Augustin* cast all the blame (as you here say) upon *Stephen*, and none at all upon St. *Cyprian*;  
and

498 *The fourth Misconceit discovered.*

and that we could not make good what we had said, that *St. Augustin* was offend-  
ed with *St. Cyprians* words, and disliked  
them. For both the manifest untruth of  
your perswasion, and the evident truth of  
ours in this would undeniably have ap-  
peared, had those words been adjoyned  
by you to the rest of the sentence, as they  
are in the sentence. Neither can you say,  
that you either knew not, or took no no-  
tice of the said words; for you cite them  
particularly some leaves after, as said by  
*St. Augustin*, without citing either the  
place where, or of what words he speaks,  
lest notice should be taken, that they are  
here said of *St. Cyprians* words, and so  
your unfair dealing be detected. Neither  
will it acquit you to say, though *St. Au-  
gustin* judged those words had the danger of  
a pernicious dissension, yet thereby he  
shewed no dislike of them. For had  
they been a most just and necessary de-  
fence of *St. Cyprian*, they could not have  
contained any such danger: for *Stephen*  
in that case ought to have acquiesced;  
and if he had fallen into dissension with  
*St. Cyprian*, it had been his fault onely,  
and not any danger, which his just defence  
con-



*The fourth Misconceit discovered.* 499

contained of that dissension. As when an innocent person uses a just defence against the unjust oppression of his adversary ; and his adversary thereupon falls into a *pernicious dissension* with him ; his defence cannot be rightly said to have had the danger of *that dissension*. For every one is obliged to avoid the danger of a *pernicious dissension* , but no man is obliged to avoid his own just defence.

**S E C T.**

**SE CT. 5.** *The fifth Misconceit declared.*

**C. 8.**

**F**ifthly you misconceive, that *Stephen* excommunicated in the time of *St. Cyprian*, before he spake those words, the African Bishops: whence you affirm with another misconception, that those words accused *Stephen* as Schismaticall. For as we said, *St. Cyprian* was never excommunicated by *Stephen*.

**P. 8.**

*Next you object to us, that we misconceive, that Stephen excommunicated (in the time of St. Cyprian, before he spake those words) the African Bishops; and you adde, that St. Cyprian was never excommunicated by Stephen; and we had nowhere said he was: we said onely, that Cyprian justified himself and his party (in which was Firmilian) against the Popes pretense of excommunicating them, (h.e.) the part of Cyprian (as we meant our words) which we again interpreted thus,*  
 Avowing

*The fifth Misconceit discovered.* 501

Avowing their exemption from any such pretended power in Stephen to cut them off from the Catholique Communion. So that by the pretense of excommunication, (if you will needs, against our meaning, refer our words to St Cyprian also) we interpreted our selves to mean the pretense of a power (if he would use that power and threatning that he would) to cut them off from Catholique Communion: and as to the African Bishops joyning with Cyprian, we meant some actuall attempt of some sort of excommunicating them. And for this (St. Cyprian the mean while being no where expressed by us to be excommunicated by Stephen) we produce undeniable evidence. For both those words of St. Cyprian in the African Councell (if spoken against Stephen the Bishop of Rome in his carriage in that debate, as we shall prove anon, when you go about to disprove it.) do insinuate some attempt of some sort of excommunicating the African Bishops of part with Cyprian, (whether St. Cyprian himself or no.) We judging no man, nor removing any one from the right of Communion, if he differ from us in judgement. For neither doth any of us make  
him-

502 *The fifth Misconceit discovered.*

himself Bishop of Bishops, or by tyrannicall terrour compell his Colleagues to a necessity of obeying..... Since every Bishop can no more be judged by another, then he can judge that other; but that we all expect the judgement of our Lord Jesus Christ, who onely and alone hath power of setting us in the Government of the Church, and of judging of our act: *clearly hinting, say we again, Stephen the Pope, who, they thought, did menace, and go about to judge some of them at least, and their Colleagues, and making himself Bishop of Bishops by tyrannical terrour, endeavoured to compell his Colleagues to a necessity of subscribing to his judgement.*

C. 9.

You endeavour in vain to acquit yourselves of your next Misconceit, of affirming, the African Bishops in the time of St. Cyprian to have been excommunicated by Stephen, and denying, that you ever said, St. Cyprian was excommunicated by him. Your words are these: whereupon we charged you with those Misconceits, *viz. speaking of St. Cyprians justifying himself and his part (in which was*  
Firmi-

Firmilian) against the Popes pretense of excommunicating them. For who sees not, that the relative *them*, when there is no exception or restriction expressed to the contrary, must necessarily be referred to all the Correlatives, which went before, and not to one onely part of them? As if one should have said of Bishop Land, as you say here of St. Cyprian, thus: *The Bishop of Canterbury justified himself and his party against the Popes pretense of excommunicating them*; what living flesh could conceive, that this proposition were to be understood (or could be, as it there lies) without any further explication restraining it, (as in yours there is none) of the party onely of the Bishop of *Canterbury*, and not of himself? Again, what reason could *Stephen* pretend to excommunicate the party of St. Cyprian, which were onely secondary instruments, and not excommunicate St. Cyprian, who was the prime cause and chief authour and mover of the opinion of Rebaptization, against *Stephen*? Neither is your other excuse sufficient; for though you say after, in another Paragraph, that Saint *Augustin* commends Saint Cyprian  
for.

504 *The fifth Misconceit discovered.*

for avowing their exemption from any such pretended power in Stephen, to cut them off from Catholique Communion, yet this evinces not, that in the former sentence, by pretense of excommunicating *Them*, you meant onely the pretended power to excommunicate them, and not the pretended excommunication it self. For you might very connaturally mean the actuall Excommunication in the first, and the power of Excommunicating in the second: and you are to be thought to have meant so, both because the pretense of excommunicating them signifies actuall excommunication; and because you never intimated in those two Paragraphs, that the second was an explication, or determination of your minde in the first. And who can doubt, but you now justifie your selves, both from the pretense (as you think) of excommunicating you, and from his pretended power in the Pope to excommunicate you; and yet mean not the one by the other. Moreover you joyn *Firmilian* here to the party of *St. Cyprian*: now we have proved, and you must grant, that those of the East, and consequently *Firmilian*,  
were

*The fifth Misconceit discovered.* 505

were actually excommunicated; therefore you must understand those words, *pretense of excommunicating them*, of actuall excommunication, and not of the sole power, or threat of it.

Your producing the words of St. Cyprian Spoken in the Councell, to prove that *Stephen* had made some attempt of excommunicating those of *Africa*, (which you call an *undeniable evidence*, and that notwithstanding you know, we have denied it twice or thrice) is to small purpose; both because it is now in controverſie, whether it imports any ſuch matter concerning *Stephen*, or be any way meant of him; and if (for the preſent) that were admitted, it would prove nothing to your purpoſe. For his excommunicating thoſe of the Eaſt might have given ſufficient occaſion to St. Cyprian, to have hinted at him for judging other Biſhops, and pretending to be Biſhop of Biſhops, though he had attempted nothing againſt thoſe of *Africa*. Neither if thoſe words had evinced ſome attempt in *Stephen* to excommunicate thoſe of *Africa*, would they make any thing againſt us (in what we ſay, and you pretend

Z



506 *The fifth Misconceit discovered.*

tend to answer here) who deny not the attempt or *threat*, but the actuall excommunication of the African Bishops, and St. *Cyprian*.

Your next citation of St. *Cyprians* words against *Stephen*, as they prove onely the said attempt, or threat onely, and so evince nothing to what we say here so they demonstrate neither regard to St. *Augustin*, in citing those words of St. *Cyprian verbatim*, which St. *Augustin* thought better (as we already have proved, and you hereafter acknowledge) to be passed over in silence; nor to St. *Cyprian*, in producing against that Holy Martyr those very words, and exposing them to the publique view of every illiterate Reader, in a vulgar language, which St. *Augustin* acknowledged to have the danger of a pernicious dissension; and in which he defends the now condemned error of Rebaptization; and accuses *Stephen* for taking the Patronage of Heretiques (as St. *Cyprian* then thought) by allowing their Baptisme to be good, and not to be reiterated; and affirms, that to abstain (from Communion) those who defend Rebaptization, is to excommunicate

cate those, who defend *the truth of Christ and the unity of the Church*; and consequently (if any force of truth be constituted by you in those words of St. Cyprian) the whole œcumenicall most holy Councell of *Nice* is to be judged to have excommunicated persons for defending *the truth of Christ, and the unity of the Church*, when they anathematized those Rebaptizers, and condemned them as Heretiques. Thus you seem not to care whom you neglect, or hurt, so you may say something in your own defence.

Your citing, and reciting the same words of *Firmilian*, as it proves no more, then what you cited from St. Cyprian, (and much lesse, because of the greater passion shewed in them) so are they not fit to be rehearsed: onely we observe, that for your advantage, you would understand what he sayes of the Legates sent to *Stephen*, of the Legates from *Africa*. contrary to *Baronius*, who understands them to be the Legates of the East; and seeing the constitution and relation of *Firmilians* words will bear that sense, I know not why your particu-

308 *The fifth Misconceit discovered.*

lar interpretation should overbear that of the most famous Historian, *Baronius*; especially, when it was to little purpose for *Firmilian* to have related to Saint *Cyprian*, how *their* Legates were used by *Stephen*; when he was to suppose, that that was better known to St. *Cyprian*, then to himself; and because neither Saint *Cyprian*, nor any of the African Bishops are related to have complained of *Stephen* for so harsh an usage of their Legates by *Stephen*; And that, as you grant, those from whom they were sent, not being excommunicated by *Stephen*, why should he be thought to proceed against their Legates in all rigour, as against excommunicated persons? when the words may be understood of the Legates, of persons already excommunicated, to wit, of those of the East. Whence this Argument may be pressed against you. *Stephen* proceeded against the Legates sent to him, as against excommunicated persons: Therefore they were sent to him from persons excommunicated: but they were sent to him either from those of the East, or from those of *Africa*: not from those of *Africa*, as you

you here contend ; for you contend also, that they were not excommunicated : Therefore they were sent from those of the East ; and consequently you must confesse, that those of the East (and so *Firmilian*, as chief defender of Rebaptization among them) were excommunicated. And thus in stead of bringing Arguments for your selves, you furnish your Adversaries with Arguments against you.

You say next, that you understand not, that when *Firmilian* said, that *Stephen* had cut off himself from all, that by all is to be understood rigorously simply all, but *universalite accommodâ*, from all the party which in this contention he opposed ; quite contrary to what you said in a former Answer to our Reasons, p. 11. in our Copy ; where you prove, that *Stephen* (according to *Firmilian*) by excommunicating others unjustly (as you pretend) consequentially separated himself from the Church ; because *Firmilian* proved that *Stephen* was an Apostata from the Ecclesiasticall unity, by this reason, viz. *For whilest thou thoughtest to cut off others from thee, thou hast onely cut off thy self from all.* Now whether you under-

510 *The fifth Misconceit discovered.*

stand by *Church* here, the whole visible Church, as we have proved, you must do; or the company of the lively members of Christ, which is the invisible, as you do; yet you must necessarily understand by it, more then whom *Stephen* then opposed; and consequently, if there *Firmilian* prove well, that *Stephen* separated himself consequentially from the Church, because he cut off himself from *all*, you must either by *all* understand more then those whom he opposed, or plainly contradict your selves. Secondly, by this your so streight interpretation of the word *all*, you quite overthrow your main fundamentall argument, drawn against us from the instance of *Firmilian*, and so put (your selves) a period to that controverſie, without any further answer of ours. For which of us either ever denied or doubted (or indeed could do so) that *Stephen* by excommunicating others, whether justly or unjustly, as you pretend, separated himself from all those, whom he opposed, (*viz.* by that excommunication?) And when this is granted you, how will you ever prove him a Schismaticque, because he is separated from those, whom

whom he excommunicates, onely? So long as he remains united to the Body of the Church, both visible and invisible; the one of which separations is necessarily consequent (even according to you) to every unjust Excommunication, which, you say, are universally Schismaticall.

*Firmilians* saying, that there were different customes in different particular Churches, without breach of peace and unity betwixt them, is most true: but he erred in the application of that truth. For the custome of not Rebaptizing Heretiques, was not a particular practice of some particular Church, but the universal ancient custome of the universall Church, as *St. Augustin* affirms, and *St. Cyprian* acknowledges: and the contrary practice in the East Church was begun in the Councell of *Iconium*, and the contrary doctrine in the South in *Africa*, in the Councells of *Carthage*.

Your citing the following words of *Firmilian*, to prove that *Stephen* made some attempt to excommunicate those of *Africa*, first proves it not. For the former part of the Sentence, viz. *Stephen* is not ashamed to give patronage to such

§ 12 *The fifth Misconceit discovered*

against the Church, & *fraternitatem sci-*  
*dere*, and to rent the Brotherhood, viz. of  
 Christian Brethren: for all this may be  
 verified in his excommunicating those of  
 the East; though he had attempted no-  
 thing against those of *Africa*: for by  
 that excommunication he had (in *Firmi-*  
*lians* sense and yours) rent the Brother-  
 hood. Neither speaks the second part of  
 this sentence to your purpose, viz. *And*  
*moreover to call Cyprian a false Christ,*  
*and a false Apostle, and a deceitfull worker,*  
*&c.* For how many times may one Bishop  
 speak such words against another, and yet  
 attempt nothing at all to separate them  
 from the Church by excommunication;  
 which appears by the next following  
 words, viz. *Who (Stephen) being consci-*  
*ous, that all these things were in himself,*  
*he deservedly ought to hear spoken of him-*  
*self, &c.* Where *Firmilian* retorts upon  
*Stephen* the very same Accusations, which  
 he affirms *Stephen* to have pronounced  
 against St. *Cyprian*: and yet neither  
 you, nor any Modern or Ancient Au-  
 thour affirm, that *Firmilian* either Ex-  
 communicated, or attempted to Excom-  
 municate *Stephen* and his Adherents, be-  
 cause



*The fifth Misconceit discovered.* 513

cause he framed such accusations against him. Hence therefore appears, that you have not proved *Stephens* attempt to have Excommunicated those of *Africa*, or any of them, from those words of *Firmilian* : and yet if you proved it, you had evinced nothing against us ; who in the charging you with this misconception, denied not the attempt, but the actual Excommunication of the *African Bishops*. Our words are these, viz. *You misconceive, that Stephen Excommunicated, in the time of St. Cyprian, before he spake those words, the African Bishops, &c.*

---

## S E C T. 6.

¶ *The sixth Misconceit laid open.*

## C. 9.

Sixthly, you misconceive the deduction of your Argument from St. *Cyprian*, and his words in that Councell, to confer any thing to the corroborating of your instance of *Firmilian* against our definition. For *Firmilian* was not in the same state of actuall Communion with the Church, when he wrote those words, as St. *Cyprian* was : nor were St. *Cyprians* words cited by you, those which were compared to *Firmilians*. And then what Argument can be brought from St. *Cyprians* words by you cited, and his example and proceeding, to confirm against us your instance of *Firmilian*. You must therefore as you do in effect, acknowledge this instance of *Firmilian* to be of no force, and frame a new Argument from new words of St. *Cyprian*, not so much as pointed at by us in our answer, which how much also they will prove, shall presently be seen.

The

The words which you cite out of St. *Augustin* in divers places, and those of St. *Cyprian*, we acknowledge to be their words; and most willingly subscribe to the Authority of those two great Saints, and esteem those of St. *Cyprian* to be full of Truth and Peace, as St. *Augustin* did. And what advantage soever you endeavour to deduce from them, we will endeavour also to give a cleare Answer to it.

*See from  
p. 417. 10  
p. 425.*

You therefore reciting these words of St. *Cyprian*, viz. *Neither doth any of us make himself Bishop of Bishops*, make this deduction, *clearly hinting* (say you) *Stephen the Pope, who they thought did so*. We deny that clearly, and affirm, that you cannot prove, that there was any hinting at all, neither clearly, nor obscurely, against *Stephen* in them. You will tell us, that we deny it *gratis*. I answer, that we deny nothing, but according to that rule, which you your self have chosen for the knowledge of the true sense of St. *Cyprians* words, viz. St. *Augustin*, who affirms, that these words related and hinted onely at St. *Cyprians* own Authority,

516 *The sixth Misconceit discovered.*

rity, as being Primate of *Africa*, and  
 lawful Superiour to all those Bishops,  
 who were present in that Council: and  
 his intention was, saith *St. Augustin*, to  
 excite them, and free them from all fear  
 of being excommunicated by him, if they  
 uttered any thing in the Council contrary  
 to his and the other Bishops opinions in  
 the matter of rebaptization. *St. Augustins*  
 words are these, *lib. 3. cont. Donatist. ca.*  
*3.* For he (*St. Cyprian*) did not lye, nor  
 think to catch the more simple of his fellow  
 Bishops in their words, that when they  
 shewed themselves of a different opinion  
 from him, he contrary to what he had pro-  
 mised, should resolve to Excommunicate  
 them: neither did he say any thing, which  
 he bore not in his heart: Which shew  
 plainly, that those words were spoken  
 sincerely by *St. Cyprian*, to assure them;  
 that he would make no use of his Eccle-  
 siasticall Authority against them, for de-  
 livering whatsoever they thought true,  
 even against him, in that Councel. And  
 sure had *St. Cyprian* hinted against *Ste-*  
*phen* in those words, *St. Augustin* would  
 have known it, who had much more rea-  
 son to understand the meaning of *St.*  
*Cyprian*,

*Cyprian*, then you can have. Beside it would have been wholly impertinent, nay, ridiculous in those Bishops, to have feared any Excommunication from *Stephen*, in case any of them had dissented from *St. Cyprians* opinion in that Councell; for they knew well enough, that *Stephen* in an Epistle written newly before that Councell, had declared himself point-blank against *St. Cyprians* opinion; and consequently that *Stephen* would be so far from excommunicating them for dissenting therein from *St. Cyprian*, that he would have tenderly loved them, and highly praised them for it. Then you urge the next ensuing words of *St. Cyprian*, viz. *Whereas every Bishop hath his proper arbitrement of his own power for the lawfull liberty given to him, and may no more be judged by another Bishop, then he can judge another.*

We answer, that these words are onely to be understood in such points and cases, as are yet left doubtfull and indifferent, or not fully and finally determined in the Church: and not in those, which have already received a full determination. You will tell us, that this is some new invention,

518 *The sixth Misconceit discovered.*

vention, or quiddity of ours, coined of purpose to avoid the difficulty. For seeing the words have no such limitation, what reason have we to limit them? and we tell you, *ad Augustinum appellastis, ad Augustinum ibitis*; You have appealed to Austin, to Austin shall you go. For this limitation, which we give, was given by him 1200. years ago. St. *August. ibid.* explicating these words of St. Cyprian, *Nec possit alium judicare, &c.* saith thus, *Opinor utique in his questionibus, quonondum eliquatissimâ perspectione discussæ sunt: noverat enim quanti Sacramenti profunditatem tunc omnis Ecclesia variâ disputatione versabat, liberumque faciebat quarendi arbitrium, ut examinata veritas panderetur.* I am of opinion, saith St. *Augustin*, that those words of St. Cyprian, (*viz.* that no Bishop can judge another, or be judged by him, &c.) are to be understood in those questions, which were not discussed with a most clear perspicuity. For he (St. Cyprian) knew, with how various a disputation every Church agitated the depth of so great a mystery, or obscurity; and gave free liberty of enquiry, that the truth being examined might be made manifest.

*The sixth Misconceit discovered.* 519

*manifest.* No otherwise then at this present Bishops and Doctors among us have liberty of holding, with peace, communion and charity, what they please, in matters not yet determined, nor forbidden to be disputed. And the like exposition is to be, for the same reason, extended to the ensuing words of St. Cyprian, where he saith, *That Bishops are to render an account onely to our Saviour, who onely hath power to judge of their actions.* For otherwise, if onely our Saviour had power to judge them in any thing whatsoever they did or taught, the power of Archbishops over Bishops, of Metropolitans over Archbishops, of Primates over Metropolitans, of Patriarchs over Primates, and of a generall Councell over them all, (all which you acknowledge) and consequently the whole Hierarchy, Order, and Discipline of the Church would be overthrown.

Next you descend to another excuse of a Misconceit, charged by us upon you, about these words, *Episcopus Episcoporum*, &c. spoken by St. Cyprian in the Councell of Carthage. You affirming, and we denying, that they were meant  
of



520 *The sixth Misconceit discovered.*

of *Stephen*. That the nature and true state of this controverſie betwixt us may be rightly underſtood, it is to be remembered, that in the firſt answer rendered by us to *Firmilians* case, we ſaid, that Saint *Cyprian* had uttered certain words againſt *Stephen*, wherein St. *Augustin* affirmed, that St. *Cyprian* did *pati aliquid humani*, i. e. ſome humane paſſion of anger and indignation againſt *Stephen*. To diſprove this, you alledge many places of St. *Augustin*, wherein he praiſes St. *Cyprian* for his ſpirit of peace and unity; and particularly this place now in controverſie. To this we answer, that theſe words were neither the words which we pointed at, (which were thoſe in his Epiſtle to *Pompeius*, and againſt which Saint *Augustin* excepts, as reſiſhing of humane paſſion, and endangering a pernicious diſſenſion, as we have already proved) nor ſpoken, or meant by St. *Cyprian* againſt *Stephen*. So that hence it appears, that the immediate controverſie betwixt us was, whether St. *Augustin* (whom you had taken for the rule to know St. *Cyprian's* meaning) thought, that St. *Cyprian* ſpoke theſe words againſt *Stephen*,  
and

*The sixth Misconceit discovered.* 521

and judging, that he spake them against him, did notwithstanding praise them, as full of peace, unity, and charity: for unlesse this were so, your proof from St. *Augustins* authority, to prove that the words of St. *Cyprian* against *Stephen*, like to those of *Firmilian* cited by you, were praise-worthy, and of Authority, (which we had denied) had been of no force at all. For whatsoever *in re* was of S. *Cyprians* meaning in those words, if St. *Augustin* thought they were not meant by St. *Cyprian* against *Stephen*, when he thus praised them, you can never evince from St. *Augustins* giving praise and authority to them, that the words which St. *Cyprian* spake against *Stephen*, like those of *Firmilian*, are really of Authority; and consequently *Firmilians* like words pressed for your definition against us: the reason is, because that if St. *Augustin*, either had no actual thought, or knowledge, that these words of St. *Cyprian* were spoken against *Stephen*, or had an actual judgement, they were not meant against him, he can never be prudently thought to authorize, or allow of words spoken against *Stephen*

522 *The sixth Misconceit discovered*

*phen* by his praising or allowing them. Seeing therefore we have already proved, (and you also grant our proof to be of force) that *St. Augustin* judged that those words were meant of *St. Cyprian*, by reason of his Primacie over *Africa*; and never insinuates, that they were meant by him against *Stephen*, we have sufficiently manifested, that *St. Augustin* had no thought (as far as can be collected from his works, or prudently supposed) that those words were intended by *St. Cyprian* against *Stephen*: and your striving to infirm our Argument drawn from *St. Augustins* understanding them of *St. Cyprian*, by saying, *That* ~~that~~ *binders not their being also understood against Stephen, for they may be understood of both,* is insufficient to abate the force of our Argument. For the question is not now, what sense they may have absolutely in themselves, but what sense *St. Augustin* judged they had. Now as it never appears, that he judged they had both these senses; so it is clearly collected from him, that *St. Augustin* judged, they had not both of them, but were onely understood of *St. Cyprian*. For other-  
wise

wise it is prudently, if not necessarily to be supposed, that, seeing St. *Augustin*, excepted against other words spoken against *Stephen* by St. *Cyprian*, he would also have made the same exception against these; at least he would not so highly have praised them, as full of peace and humility; seeing there had been (according to his judgement of St. *Cyprian*'s words against *Stephen*) some seeds of dissention in them. Hence therefore clearly appears, that you have not proved from St. *Augustin* (as you undertake to prove) that words of St. *Cyprian* spoken against *Stephen*, like those of *Firilian*, are of sufficient Authority to found a solid Argument: And hence also your present Misconcept, charged by us upon you, is patent and unavoidable; your endeavouring therefore to prove so largely, either from the words themselves, or from *Baronius*, that they were meant by St. *Cyprian* against *Stephen*, confers nothing, to give force to the *medium*, which you had taken for the corroborating your argument, viz. by St. *Augustin*'s authority: unless you prove from him, that he thought they were spoken against

§24 *The sixth Misconceit discovered.*

against *Stephen*, and yet praised them; and this we desire may be done in your next Answer. Yet because this difficulty may be pressed independently of *St. Augustins* Authority upon some other occasion, we will (though not of present obligation, yet by way of prevention, examine those words absolutely in themselves, and satisfy what you alledge for your interpretation of them.

You first cite certain words out of *St. Cyprians* Epistle to *Pompeius*, cited before by you, and here recited with an &c. all which shew nothing but the error of *St. Cyprian*, and the truth of *Stephens* Doctrine in the matter of Rebaptization, viz. as you cite them at length, **B. II.** *Doth he (Stephen) give honour to God, who communicates with Marcions Baptisme?* that is, who allows *Marcions* Baptisme to be good and valid, and not to be reiterated: and you might have cited the next words following, *Gives he honour to God, who not holding the Unity and Truth coming from the Divine Law, vindicates an Heresie against the Church? i. e.* who affirms, that the Baptisme of Heretiques, who are against the Church,

is

*The sixth Misconceipt discovered. 325*

is true Baptisme: And the next that follow, Gives he honour to God, who judges that remission of sins may be given by, or amongst those, who blaspheme God? And these, Gives he honour to God, who thinks that the friends of Heretiques, and the enemies of Christ hold the truth of Christ, and the Unity of the Church? that is, have true Baptisme, and one and the same Baptisme with the Church. And then after your &c. and slipping over all these interrogatories, which plainly shew, that St. Cyprian reprehends Stephen for oppugning Rebaptization and nothing else, you cite these words, which seem to say something like to a proot of your interpretation of Saint Cyprians words; viz. *Doth he give honour to God, who being a friend of Heretiques, and an enemy of Christians, doth think, that the Priests of God (the Bishops) which maintain the truth of Christ, and Unity of the Church, should be abstained? (or kept from the Communion of the Church?)* Which words are quite different from what I finde in this Epistle to Pompeius, and which I now last cited in English, in the Edition of Erasmus, Printed at Basil,  
*Anno*

526 *The sixth Misconceit discovered.*

*Anno 1558. pag. 230.* which have nothing at all of *Priests, or Bishops, being abstained*: so that, though we doubt not of your having read it as you cite it, (which notwithstanding for fuller satisfaction of the Auditory, it were fit to be noted by you, in what Edition and Page you finde them) yet at the least it makes the citation doubtfull; and so of no sufficient Authority to found an Argument; because it is quite otherwise in other Copies. Yet even the words as you cite them to your most advantage, they make very slenderly for you. For Saint *Cyprian* there manifestly defends Rebaptization to be a Chaitian truth, and declares it to be contrary to Gods honour to Excommunicate any for holding that doctrine; and therein condemns not onely *Stephen*, but the whole Oecumenicall Councell of *Nice*; who Anathematized all those as Heretiques, who defended it, as we have said above. Neither can you answer, that when Saint *Cyprian* wrote these words, the truth was not so fully known, as it was after his death, and before the Councell of *Nice* was celebrated; For St. *Cyprian* speaks



speaks here of the truth of the Doctrine (as he thought) of Rebaptization; who then made no question at all of the truth of it, nor esteemed it doubtful or uncertain, and judged it absolutely contrary to Christian truth and Gods honour, to excommunicate any one for holding it. But you will reply, that though St. Cyprian erred in this, yet it shews, that the other words, *Episcopus Episcoporum*, &c. were also hinting against Stephen. I answer, that if you grant, that St. Cyprian proceeded erroneously in that hinting against Stephen, as he did in the former sentence, whose cause I pray you will be hurt by that hinting, yours or ours? Farther, though from this uncertainty of St. Cyprians words might be drawn, that it is possible, that St. Cyprian hinted at Stephen in these words *Episcopus Episcoporum*, &c. yet that helps you nothing; no, though it followed thence, that there is some likelihood of it. For either you must prove, that it is necessary to understand his words in that your sense, or you conclude nothing at all against us. For we have still our liberty to answer, till that be proved, that these words of  
St,

528 *The sixth Misconceit discovered.*

St. *Cyprian* may be also understood otherwise, as St. *Augustin* and we understand them.

Your citing *Firmilians* words against *Stephen* will prove little; for it is not certain, that those words were written or received when S. *Cyprian* spake those words in the Councell; and it belongs to you to prove it. The Title of *Episcopus Episcoporum*, Bishop of Bishops, which you urge to infer your interpretation, we will presently examine: we now onely demand, that if that were the Title of the Bishop of *Rome* in those primitive and pure times, either it was his *just title*, and then you condemn St. *Cyprian* for condemning *Stephen* in the making use of it, and so take away all Authority from those his words; because in this supposition they are false and injurious to *Stephen*, in infringing his lawfull Title and Authority, as if it were usurpation and tyranny: or it was an *unjust*, and *undue Title*, assumed by the Bishops of *Rome* out of pride and arrogance; which were very hard and uncharitable to affirm of so many holy Bishops, and Martyrs, who from *Zepherine Pope*, and before him assumed it,

it, (if your allegation from *Tertullian* be of force;) and withall improbable, that so many other holy persons should in those times frequently (as *Baronius* affirms) have given him that Title, as due to the dignity of his See, if it had not been due to him. What therefore can accrue either to your cause, or your selves, save disadvantage, if this Title of *Episcopus Episcoporum* were in those times the known Title of the Bishop of *Rome*.

Thus you descend to borrow the last support for your interpretation, from the Authority of *Baronius*, who interprets those words, *Episcopum Episcoporum*, to be by *St. Cyprian* tacitely meant of *Stephen*: and think, that you have quite overthrown our cause by producing so grave an Authour, and famous Hiltorian for your interpretation. And indeed had we no support, save our own assertion, against so grave an Authour, it would have proved no small disparagement to our interpretation: but you may please to take notice, that in a Counter-balance we have a double Authority, each of them of equall poize to yours, against your single one; to wit, the two most eminent

530 *The sixth Misconceit discovered.*

Cardinalls, and no less eminent Historians and Controvertists, *Bellarmin* and *Peron*; who both deny, that these words of *St. Cyprian* were hinting against *Stephen*. *Bellarmin. libr. 2. de Rom. Pontif. cap. 16. Paragraph ad secundum*, sayes thus, *Ad secundum dico, Cyprianum, cum ait neminem se facere Episcopum Episcoporum, loqui de iis, qui in Concilio illo Carthagenensi erant, nec includi in eâ sententiâ Romanum Pontificem.* I answer, sayes *Bellarmin*, to the second (objection) that when *St. Cyprian* sayes, that none makes himself Bishop of Bishops, he speaks of those who were in that Councell of Carthage, and that the Bishop of Rome is not included in that sentence. And Cardinall *Peron*, in the English Translation, in his reply to King *James*, Book 3. cha. 3. p. 236. sayes thus of the said words of *St. Cyprian*, *We answer, that he speaks there onely of the Bishops of Africa, to whom he directs his speech, and whom he exhorts to tell their opinion freely in the Councell, without being held back by the respect of the Authority, that as Primate of Africa he had over them.* Thus he; who by reason of the eminency of his learning in History and Controversie,

Controversie, cannot prudently be supposed to have been ignorant of the contrary opinion of *Baronius*. Seeing therefore this Learned Cardinall, after a farther examination of the said words, ventures to contradict *Baronius*, why was it unlawfull for us to follow *Peron* against him? especially seeing we have St. *Augustin* so consonant to our interpretation, as we have already proved.

But you will answer, that you urge not the bare Authority, but the reason of *Baronius* also, which seems to evince the truth of your interpretation. For seeing (as *Baronius* affirms) that *Bishop of Bishops* was the common title of the Bishops of *Rome*, whom can St. *Cyprian* probably be thought to point at, saying, (*Neque enim quisquam nostrum se Episcopum Episcoporum constituit.*; For neither doth any of us constitute himself *Bishop of Bishops*.) save *Stephen Bishop of Rome*? But as we overswayed in the former, so will we now at least counterpoise the Authority of *Baronius*. For *Bellarmin*, who *libr. 2. de Rom. Pont. cap. 31 num. 1.* reckons up all the Titles anciently, and usually given to the Bishop of *Rome*,

makes no mention of this amongst them. Neither indeed concludes the reason of *Baronius*, that this was his Title, or assumed by the Bishops as such; because *Tertullian* in his Book *de Pudicitia* affirms not, that it was his usuall Title, or that those words, *Episcopus Episcoporum* was prefixed to his decree, but by way of *Ironie*, or jeer, gives it him. For he stiles him also in the same place and manner, as *Baronius* acknowledges, *Bonus Pastor*, and *Benedictus Papa*; and yet those precise words were not his Titles: neither would any of those holy and humble Martyr-Popes have assumed them: and though in some other private Authours this or other the like honourable appellations might have been given to the Roman Bishops, yet that concludes not, that it was their known Title, or that they assumed it to themselves. If therefore you will evince, that none but *Stephen* could be pointed at by this saying of *St. Cyprian*, because it is the proper Title of the Roman Bishop, you must either prove that the Bishops of *Rome* (and particularly *Stephen*) assumed this Title, and prefixed it in their letters; or that it

was

*The sixth Misconceit discovered.* 533

was given them in some general, or particular Councell; or by some of the holy Fathers, or by some Heathen Historians, who took notice of it, as being usually attributed to them by Christians; and not a bare appellation, or honourable expression given them, or pronounced of them by particular persons. Now *Baronius*, (at least as he is epitomized by *Spondanus*) bringing no other authority, save the Ironie of *Iertullian*, then become a Montanist, and the Acts of *St. Sebastians* Martyrdome, to prove this to be his Title, seems not to give sufficient proof against *Bellarmin*, that this was the Title assumed by the Roman Bishop: neither will your asserting it (upon *Baronius* his authority and reasons) be convincing; that those words, *Bishop of Bishops*, must necessarily point at *Stephen* the Pope, as being a title assumed by him and his Predecessours.

As to your asserting, with *Baronius*, that those words, *Aut tyrannico terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem collegas suos adigit*, have a necessary relation to Pope *Stephens* threat of excommunicating those who held contrary to him in the point of



534 *The sixth Misconceit discovered.*

Rebaptization, we answer, that no such relation is necessary; because those words have a full and compleat sense, being related onely to the Authority of *St. Cyprian*, as Primate over the other Bishops there present, as *St. Augustin* relates them. But then you demand, *Where saith St. Augustin, that they related onely to St. Cyprian, and his promise of not excommunicating, &c. or where hath he any word, or words equivalent to that exclusive?* We have answered this already; that had *St. Augustin* judged, as you do, that *St. Cyprian* had Ironized against *Stephen* in these words, he would never have praised them for being full of peace and humility, as he did here; (unlesse you would have him to praise and approve in one place, what he disproves in another) but have excepted against them, as containing seeds of dissention, and spoken of them, with some kind of indignation, as we have proved he did of those in his Epistle to *Pompeius*, written against *Stephen*. For how could he conceive, that the accusing *Stephen* to assume a Title not due to him, and injurious to all the Bishops of the Church, (which notwithstanding

withstanding, according to you, had been assumed ever since, and before the time of *Tertullian* and *Zepherine*, by his Predecessours) and that he behaved himself tyrannically in that assumed dignity, should not be exceedingly displeasing to *Stephen*, and subject to breed no lesse a pernicious dissention betwixt them, then the other words of his Epistle, against which *St. Augustin* excepts? Seeing therefore here he praises these, and there excepts against the like words, had these been understood by him to point and taunt at *Stephen*, we satisfie fully, that both here and elsewhere, he hath not onely a word or words, (which you say, *we have not, nor we cannot shew*) but whole sentences, which convince, that these words (in *St. Augustins* judgement) were onely related to *St. Cyprians* authority, and promise, and not at all meant by *St. Cyprian* against *Stephen*.

And here you fall short, when you accuse us of *shortnesse of discourse*, in deducing a negative, or exclusive from a bare affirmative, as if we had said thus, *St. Augustin* affirms, that these words of *St. Cyprian* were meant of *St. Cyprian*; there-

336 *The sixth Misconceit discovered.*

fore he sayes, they were meant of Saint *Cyprian* *enely*, or not of *Stephen* also. For our discourse is this, St. *Augustin*, who praises these words here for peace and humility, saying they were meant of St. *Cyprian*, must be understood to say, they were meant of St. *Cyprian* *enely*, and not of *Stephen*; because had he judged, that they had been meant against *Stephen*, he could not have so praised them, without being contrary to himself, and to what he sayes in another place. And to this we require a punctual answer.

If therefore it cannot be said, that St. *Augustin* ever judged or thought, that these words were intended against *Stephen*, (nay judged the quite contrary, that they were not) our inference (against which you except) will be in force, viz. *And sure if St. Cyprian had hinted against Stephen in those words, St. Augustin would have known it: and we adde in our Answer to B. 5. who had much more reason to understand the meaning of St. Cyprian, then you can have.*

We know not well, what to make of your ensuing discourse about St. *Cyprian* and St. *Augustin*, cited to prove, That  
an

an Inferiour may sometimes lawfully and laudably finde fault with the faulty proceedings of his Superiour, even though he were the chiefeſt Biſhop; which they confirm by *St. Pauls* reprehending *St. Peter* for compelling the Chriſtians to Judaize, &c. and *St. Peters* taking it patiently; unleſs you would either prove thence, that it is alſo lawfull for an inferiour, even to accuſe his ſuperiour of uſurpation and aſſumption of falſe and unjuſt titles and dignities, and to affirm, that he playes the Tyrant in them (as you muſt make *St. Cyprian* to have ſaid of *Stephen*, if your ſenſe of his words be true;) and that it were inſolency and arrogancie in that Superiour to defend himſelf, and vindicate his Authority thus injured by his ſubject; which inference, how ſhort it falls, we leave to any indifferent judgement: or you muſt infer from thence, that *Saint Cyprian* denyed *St. Peter* to be the Superiour of *St. Paul*, or to have any jurisdiction over him; becauſe he (and *St. Auguſtin* with him) ſay, that *St. Peter* did not vindicate himſelf, nor aſſume any thing inſolently and arrogantly, as to ſay;

538 *The sixth Misconceit discovered.*

*That he held the Primacy, and ought rather to be obeyed by those, who were newly and later called, &c.* as though a lawfull Superiour, when he is justly and duely taxed by a subject, may not carry himself insolently and arrogantly, in boasting and glorying in that Dignity and Power, which he hath over the other; and so make his Authority (though lawfull in it selfe) a cloke for his malice, and a bait for his pride. Hence therefore it is manifest, that you have neither proved (what you pretended) that either *Stephen*, lawfull Successour to *St. Peter*, was not also lawfull Superiour of *St. Cyprian*; nor that *St. Cyprian* might as lawfully accuse *Stephen* of taking a false title and dignity upon him, and carrying himself tyrannically (and according to you, schismatically) in it, as *St. Paul* might admonish *St. Peter* of a particular defect, or errour, (whereof he was guilty) which touched not at all the Dignity and Primacy of him and his See: nor that *Stephen* might not lawfully have vindicated himself, in the defence of his Dignity, (which was no fault in him) because *St. Peter* did not vindicate himself

self, in that wherein he was faulty.

As to your refutation of our second Reason, you really misconceive us, when you say, that we urge *upon your words something, that were impertinent and ridiculous.* For we neither imputed, nor intended to impute any such matter to your words, or you; but we imputed that to those Bishops in the Councell, if they had feared to be excommunicated by *Stephen* for siding with him: For we say, *It would have been impertinent, nay, ridiculous in those Bishops, to have feared Excommunication, &c.* and that not upon any inference from your words, but from a consequence drawn from the precedent interpretation of *St. Augustin*; and by this we shew also the insufficiency of your refutation of this our Reason. For we prest it not absolutely and independently, (in which sense onely you take it and proceed against it) but with a dependence and reference to the precedent interpretation of *St. Augustin*; who having said, that *St. Cyprian* spake those words, to free the Bishops there present from all fear of *Excommunication*, in speaking freely their mindes, even against him: which

540 *The sixth Misconceit discovered.*

which we then supposing, (and now have proved) to have been the totall and entire motive, why *St. Cyprian* uttered those words; we thence deduced, as a second Reason, that they could not be understood prudently, to have feared in this any Excommunication from *Stephen*. If therefore you will effectually confute this our Reason, you must prove, that *St. Cyprian* spoke these words with some other intention, then to free those Bishops from all fear of Excommunication, for speaking against his opinion in matter of Rebaptization; and not take our Reason quite otherwise, then we put it; and then refute rather you owne, then ours.

You press us exceedingly to shew some Authour, who sayes, that those of the East were *peremptory* in the defence of Rebaptization against *Stephen*. And yet we think, that you would have much ado to finde Authours to say, of many hundreds that have been excommunicated, that they were *peremptory* before in the defence of their errors. Authours set down usually the substance of the action, but descend not to mention every



ry particular circumstance. It is said by *Dionysius* in *Eusebius* above cited, that *Stephen* abstracted his Communion from them, because they baptized *Heretiques*. Now whosoever considers, that *Stephen*, as *Lirinenfis* testifies of him, was a holy and prudent man; and as *St. Augustin*, above cited, affirms of him, that even whilst he was resolved to excommunicate Rebaptizers, *vicit charitas in corde ejus*, that charity was victorious in his heart, may easily collect, that he would not excommunicate any one, who was ready to correct his fault, and who defended his error without all *obstinacy* and *pertinacy*. Again, whosoever reads attentively the letter of *Firmilian* to *St. Cyprian*, will easily gather that it proceeded from a spirit possessed with a height of contempt and disdain against *Stephen*, not onely for excommunicating them, but also for opposing them in the point of Rebaptization; and consequently that he, the leader of all the rest, and they probably by his example were peremptory. Thirdly, *Stephen* being so holy, prudent, and charitable a Pope, as we have declared, he would never have proceeded so harshly with their

§42 *The sixth Misconceit discovered.*

their Legates, (which I have shewed more probably to have been sent from those of the East) if those, who sent them, and they had addressed themselves to him in a peacefull and submissive, and not in a proud and peremptory manner.

As concerning this Question remaining not fully determined, (and so, that it was free for every Bishop to hold and practise what he pleased within his own Diocese, and without any one to have power to restrain him, or judge him for it) seeing there was no generall Councell assembled till long after St. *Cyprians* time; and yet many were both condemned for Heretiques and Schismatiques in and before his time, and accounted such through the whole Church; for otherwise this custome of Rebaptizing them could not have been treated in those times: it is manifest, that before any generall Council was celebrated, there was some determinate efficacious means to know, what was Orthodox, and what was Hereticall. Now this must either have been the universall ancient custome, consent, and tradition of the Christian world,

*The sixth Misconceipt discovered.* 543

world, or the definition of the Bishop of Rome, or the minde of the lawful Bishops of the Catholique Church delivered respectively in different Provinces and Nations, by Nationall Councils (or otherwise) and agreeing all together. Now before the Councell of *Nice* all this was done in this practice of Non-rebaptization, as we have \*already proved. Therefore though the last Complement of Determination was not given by a Generall Councell, yet there was determination sufficient to render those *Heretiques*, who contradicted it. When therefore St. *Augustin* speaks of this last determination by a General Council, he speaks not of it, as in all cases necessary, to give a sufficient determination to Points and Practices in Religion, but as the last and fullest of all the rest, and which ultimately renders those, who hold against it, inexcusable. For we have seen, that even whilst this Question was neither thus defined, nor the speculative truth of it found out, yet the sole custome of the Christian world was sufficient both to establish Christians in the belief of it, and to preserve them from the force of all the novell Reasons, which

§44 *The sixth Misconceit discovered.*

which were pressed against it. *Nondum autem factum erat (plenarium Concilium) sed consuetudinis robore tenebatur orbis terrarum; & hac sola opponebatur inducere volentibus novitatem, quia non poterant apprehendere veritatem.* "It (a Generall Council) was not yet celebrated; but "the world was held up, or kept together, by the strength of Custome, which "alone was opposed to those, who strove "to bring in Novelty, because they were "not able to apprehend the Truth. Thus *St. Augustin*, now cited. Whence most evidently appears a large disparity betwixt the case of *Stephen* and *St Cyprian*, in excommunicating those, who opposed their perswasion. For though, *St. Augustin* say, that this Question was not then determined, and that the Bishops are not to be judged and condemned by other Bishops, even their lawfull superiours, in Questions not determined; yet unlesse we make him contradict himself, we must understand this holy Doctor to mean this, either when there be onely disputable and probable Arguments on both sides, or that the Practice it self is particular or doubtfull, or that the speculative

culative difficulties even against the universall practice, seem to some so clear and unanswerable, that they perswade them to call the lawfulnessse of that Practice into question, and induce them to think, that it is crept in by corruption, and not derived from the Apostles: and whilst they thus question the Practice, it is not definitively declared and propounded to be an Apostolicall Practice; which was the present case of St. *Cyprian*. St. *Augustin*, we say, is to be understood in these cases, that those who should excommunicate those Bishops, who defend that ancient universall Practice, and the Doctrine whereupon it is grounded, should proceed tyrannically and unjustly; but St. *Augustin* is not by any means, nor cannot be understood to speak of a lawfull superior power to all other Bishops, who undoubtedly esteeming that universall Custome, or Practice, Apostolicall, (because no time or place can be designed where it begun) uses all means, even of Excommunication it self, when he judges it necessary, to preserve that Custome entire, till a more full examination and definition be made about it. For otherwise  
every

546 *The sixth Misconceit discovered.*

every particular Bishop might at his pleasure, upon certain pretended difficulties, call an universall custome of the visible Church, not defined in a generall Councell, into question, and proceed in practice contrary to it; and there were no means to restrain him, till the matter were brought to a general Councel: and then, for the first 300. years, before any such Councell was gathered, or could be gathered, every Bishop had the said freedom, and there was no way to correct him: and St. *Augustin* teaching and defending the force of that universal custome, defends also *Stephens* proceeding in defending it. And *Vincentius Lirinensis* cap. 9. speaking of the first violation of this custome, sayes thus, *Quondam igitur venerabilis memoria Agrippinus, Carthaginensis Episcopus, primus omnium mortalium, contra divinum Canonem, contra universalis Ecclesie regulam, contra sensum omnium Confacerdotum, contra morem & instituta majorum rebaptizandum esse censebat.* "Long ago, saith  
 " he, *Agrippinus* of venerable memory,  
 " Bishop of *Carthage*, the first of all men  
 " living, against the divine Canon,  
 against





548 *The sixth Misconceit discovered.*

*gebat enim vir sanctus & prudens, nihil aliud rationem pictatis admittere, nisi ut omnia, quæ fide à patribus suscepta forent, eâdem fide filiis consignarentur.* “Finally, saith he, in the Epistle which was sent to *Africa*, the same (*Stephen*) decreed in these words, Let nothing be innovated, but that which is delivered, (by tradition.) For this holy and prudent man understood, that the rule of piety admitted nothing else, then that all things which were received by faith from our Forefathers, by the same faith should be committed to our Children.

Now if it had been entirely in the free power of every Bishop to do, or hold, whatsoever he pleased, why should *Lirinensis* have praised *Stephen* for constituting such a restraining decree, whereby he took that liberty from them: And if *Stephen* were to be praised in that decree, then all those who violated it, were to be judged offenders; and if they proceeded to exorbitancy, why might *Stephen* also not have been praised for using even the censure of Excommunication to restrain them? At the least *St. Augustin* excuses  
*Stephen*

*The sixth Misconceit discovered.* 549

*Stephen* (as \*we have proved above) from all Schisme, even whilest he judged those Rebaptizers to be excommunicated; which cannot stand, if it had followed from his doctrine, that excommunicating; or threatening Excommunication, for holding and practising that error, had been schismaticall. And if you give credit to *Lirinenfis* (as we doubt not but you do) you must acknowledge, that you disgrace *St. Cyprian* not a little, in making him (as you do in this Paragraph) account *Stephen* to proceed tyrannically, in issuing out such a restraining and coercive decree or command, against those of his party: whereby their liberty assigned to them by *St. Cyprian* was taken away: which *Lirinenfis* praiseth so much in this sentence.

You spend many lines in pressing again and again this Argument against us, viz. That if *St. Cyprian*, according to Saint *Augustins* interpretation of his words, thought, that Bishops were not to be judged by other Bishops in matters not fully determined, but to be left to their own freedom; and for this reason would not judge, or exclude any who contradicted

550 *The sixth Misconceit discovered.*

contradicted him in this particular matter of Rebaptization; seeing Saint *Augustin* affirms, that this of Rebaptization was not then determined, but examined and disputed, some holding it; and others denying it; both he and St. *Cyprian* must condemn *Stephen* for Excommunicating those Bishops and Provinces, who held against him in this undetermined point. And hence you press it further to your present purpose; that seeing St. *Augustin* excuses St. *Cyprian* from schisme, because he did not Excommunicate those, who contradicted him in this difficult and doubtful question, must also consequently, by the rule of contraries, imply, that *Stephen* was guilty of schisme for doing quite contrary to St. *Cyprian*, in Excommunicating those of the East for contradicting him in it, before it was fully determined. This to my best conceiving your words, is the full force of your argument; and it is well deserving an answer.

First, therefore we answer, that though the question it self were disputed and agitated in the Church, yet the practice of not-Rebaptizing was clear and  
out

out of question, at least by St. *Cyprian* and his party; who granted it to be an Ancient, Universall practice though, as he thought, not Apostolicall. Now for asmuch as can be gathered (for ought we yet have seen) from the relation of *Stephens* proceedings, his prohibition, his threat of Excommunication, and actuall Excommunicating those of the East, was the actual infringing of this ancient custome by Rebaptizarion, &c. and for the disobeying of his command in this. For whatsoever might be disputed against it by particular Doctours, yet seeing it was an universall, ancient practice, Pope *Stephen* would have it to be observed, till the whole matter were fully determined by the Church. So that if this can be proved, *Stephen* Excommunicated none at all for disputing the question, or holding contrary opinions to him and others in it, but for actually proceeding in practice by Rebaptization, as those of the East did, according to the opinion which they held in this. For the matter being yet in dispute, and many more, as St. *Augustin* now cited, witnesseth, holding with *Stephen*, then  
with

552 *The sixth Misconceit discovered.*

with *St. Cyprian* in it , whatsoever mens particular reasons perswaded them, was not to be esteemed so certain, that contrary to the opinion of other as wise, learned, and holy as they were, and much more in number, they should proceed to a contrary practice, unused and unheard of amongst Christians. The excommunication therefore was for their disobedience in practice (which was certain and unquestionable,) and not for their particular opinions, which were disputed and doubtfull. The disparity therefore betwixt *Stephens* and *St. Cyprian*s cases consists in this, that *St. Cyprian* would not excommunicate any for holding an opinion in this against him, in a matter disputable and undetermined; and *Stephen* would and did excommunicate those, who broke for their particular opinion in a doubtfull point, an undoubted, Universall, and Ancient Practice: which disparity granted, it follows not, that *Stephen* was either to be censured as proceeding unjustly and uncharitably, or (much lesse) condemned of Schisme for excommunicating others, for one thing, because *St. Cyprian* would have been so  
for

for excommunicating others for a quite other cause. Now that *Stephens* command and excommunication were concerning the violation of this practice onely, and not for the speculation it self, appears (so far as we are able to judge) evidently. For first, the reason which *Stephen* gives in *Eusebius* of his excommunicating those of the East, is onely the contrary practice, *Quia Hereticos baptizant; Because they baptize Heretiques.* Secondly, his command recited by *St. Cyprian*, is onely concerning practice. *Nihil innovetur, nisi quod traditum est, ut manus eis imponantur ad poenitentiam.* "Let nothing be innovated, but onely "that hands be imposed upon them to "penance. Thirdly, *St. Augustin* now cited, sayes thus, *Stephanus autem etiam abstinendos putaverat, qui de suscipiendis Hereticis priscam consuetudinem convellere conabantur.* " *Stephen* also thought, "that those were to be excommunicated, "or abstained, who endeavoured to violate the ancient custome in receiving of "Heretiques. Fourthly, because *St. Cyprian*, and those with him, though of a contrary opinion from *Stephen*, and the

B b

greater

554 *The sixth Misconceit discovered.*

greater part of the Bishops, were not excommunicated by *Stephen*: which was a manifest argument, that *Stephens* excommunication was not inflicted for holding the sole opinion of Rebaptization, (which *St. Cyprian* and his did) and that they abstained, till the matter were more fully determined, and their difficulties satisfied from violating the former practice by actuall Rebaptization, (after they had received *Stephens* command) at least publique and notorious; either because the occasion offered not it it self in those short and troublesome times of persecution; or because they bare respect to the command of *Stephen* in practice, whatsoever their speculative and uncertain opinion dictated to them against it. Thus the African Bishops carried themselves in practice conformable to Pope *Zozimus* about the Councell of *Sardica's* decree for appeals, which he cited in the name of the Nicene Councel, though they could not finde any such decree, after many diligences used amongst those of the Councell of *Nice*. And *Dionysius Alexandrinus*, though speculatively favouring the opinion of Rebaptization,  
yet



yet in practice, as he relates himself in *Euseb. lib. 4. cap. 8, 9.* he proceeded according to *Stephens* command, and the common custome.

Now though it could be proved, that *Stephens* Excommunication might be extended, even to such as defended publicly and peremptorily Rebaptization, yet the cases of *Stephen* and *St. Cyprian* are very different. For *St. Cyprians* opinion had neither antiquity, nor practice, nor custome, nor so great a number of Bishops for it by many degrees, as *Stephens* had. For the far greater part then, and all their more ancient Predecessours, through the whole Church, were of *Stephens* perswasion: whereas *St. Cyprian* had but some of *Africa*, and *Firmilian*, and others, some of the East, who sided with them; some, and those very few, of their latter Predecessours, and none of the more Ancient. So that if we respect the sole externall authority for *St. Cyprians* opinion, it was no way able to sway the judgement of any prudent man to embrace it. That therefore which gave it a fair shew of truth, were onely certain difficult reasons against the other

556 *The sixth Misconceit discovered.*

perswasion, which at the first sight could not be solved; though within a short proceſſe of time the fallacy was diſcovered, and the truth found out, as St. *Auguſtin* witneſſes: nay, notwithstanding all that was ſaid againſt *Stephens* perſwaſion, the Authority of St. *Cyprians* party was ſo inconfiderable, that even whileſt they oppoſed it, the whole Chriſtian world was eſteemed to agree with *Stephen*, as we ſhall preſently ſee.

For the Doctrin of receiving thoſe, who were baptized by Heretiques, without rebaptization, may be conſidered in four different ſtates. The firſt was in the univerſall cuſtom and tradition of it amongſt Chriſtians, before it was called into queſtion. The ſecond, the retention of it by the Chriſtian world, even whileſt it was called into queſtion by ſome. The third, the finding it out to be true, and diſcovering the fallaciousneſs of the Arguments, which by ſome were brought againſt it, even by thoſe who brought them, and upon that diſcovery their relinquishing the contrary opinion, and conforming themſelves both in ſpeculation and practice to the general

*The sixth Misconceit discovered.* 557

rall and ancient custome. Fourthly, the confirmation of it, and the rejection of the contrary Doctrine in the Oecumenicall Councell of *Nice*. In every one of these states, even whilest it was deeply questioned by some, it still retained by force of Custome, to be the Tenet of the Christian world: and though speculatively it was made disputable, because the difficulties were great, which were against it, yet practically it was held certain amongst the generality of Christians, by reason that it had been received by universall Tradition; whilest the contrary opinion never gained to have more, then by the shew of seeming plausible reasons, to cause a fluctuation and wavering in the mindes of some against the generall Tradition; and a private perswasion in others, that it was to be altered.

All this, which I have here delivered, is most clearly taught by St. *Agustin*, lib. 2. *Contr. Donatist*, cap. 8. where speaking of the generall Councell of *Nice*, he sayes thus, *Nondum autem factum erat, quia consuetudinis robore tenebatur orbis terrarum; & hac sola oppo-*

558 *The sixth Misconceit discovered.*

*nebatur inducere volentibus novitatem, quia non poterant apprehendere veritatem; postea verò dum inter multos ex utraque parte tractatur & quaritur, non solum inventa est, sed etiam ad plenarij Concilij auctoritatem roburque perducta; post Cypriani quidem passionem, sed antequàm nos nati essemus. It (the Councell of Nice) was not yet celebrated, because the world was held up, or established, by the strength of Custom; (here is mentioned the first state of Stephens Tenet, viz. Ancient and Universall Custome and Tradition) and this alone was apposed against those, who desired to introduce Novelty, because they could not apprehend Verity. (Here was the second, That Tradition over-ruled the particular reasons of private persons, raised up against it.) Yet after it was treated and sought into amongst many on both sides, it was not onely found, (Here you see a third state, the finding out the truth of this Tradition,) but was also brought to the authority and strength of a plenary, or generall Councell. (This was the last and most fully defined state of it.)*

From these excellent words of this holy  
Doctour,

Doctour, we draw these Truths, in confirmation of what we have already said, and of our Doctrine against you. First, That before a generall Councell be celebrated for the determination of points in Religion, there may be the consent of the whole Christian world in that very point, which it afterwards defines. *Non-dum autem factum erat, (Concilium) quia tenebatur orbis terrarum, &c.* Secondly, That this consent of the whole Christian world in any point of Religion, is an establishment of Christians in that point, *Tenebatur orbis terrarum, &c.* Thirdly, That universall Tradition, Custome, and Practice of Christians in any matter of Religion, is sufficient to hold them constant in the profession and belief of that practice. *Consuetudinis robore tenebatur orbis terrarum.* Fourthly, That it is sufficient for Catholiques to oppose the sole Universall Custome of the whole Christian world, against all who endeavour to infringe it. *Et hac sola opponebatur inducere volentibus novitatem.* Fifthly, That the opposition made by St. Cyprian and those of his party, hindred not, in the opinion of

560 *The sixth Misconceit discovered.*

St. *Augustin*, that still those, who adhered to *Stephen* in defence of that Ancient universall Tradition, were deservedly stiled *orbis terrarum*, the whole Christian world. Sixthly, that notwithstanding St. *Cyprian* said, *That this Tradition was a corruption and abuse, crept into the Church, and no Apostolicall Tradition*, *Cyprian. Ep. ad Pompeium*. And *Firmilian*, *That the Tradition of the East Church was the contrary, and that this, maintained by those of Rome, was a meer humane Tradition*, *Firmilian. Ep. ad Cyprian*. yet because they neither did, nor could shew when it precisely begun, and it was universally observed, before they opposed it, time out of minde, it was, according to St. *Augustin*, to prevail in the mindes of Christians, as an Apostlicall, Divine, and uncorrupted Tradition, and to have strength sufficient to establish the Church in it: *Consuetudinis robore tenebatur orbis terrarum*. Seventhly, That notwithstanding all the fair, but false, pretensions from Scripture, which St. *Cyprian* and his Councils brought against it, it still stood as a wall of defence unshaken to protect the Catholique Church, in the doctrine,  
and

and observance of it : *Et hac sola apponebatur inducere volentibus novitatem.* Eighthly , that seeing this universall practice was so strong and impregnable, that the whole Church was secured and established by the strength of it ; who can rationally condemn or blame , and not rather , with *Vincentius Lirinensis* highly praise him , and that the very Donatists themselves confess , that he administered the office of his Popedom *illibate*, without blemish , and deserved to be stiled *Sanctus*, an Holy Bishop and Martyr ; and that not onely the West , but the East Church also , celebrate his Feast with a most high reverence to his holy and heroick actions ; which *Lirinensis* give him, in proceeding even to excommunicate against those, who endeavoured to violate this custome : for in the violation of that they battered the bulwark and fortress of the Catholique Church. Ninthly, hence we see clearly the difference betwixt the case of *St. Cyprian* , who had confessedly no such custome for him, and that of *Stephen* ; that it would have been tyranny, and occasionally , or interpretively schismaticall in him , to have excommunica-



§62 *The sixth Misconceit discovered*  
ted those who contradicted him in defence of this Catholique practice and tradition, because it would both have caused a command to revoke that excommunication from superiour authority, the rejection whereof would have been formall Schisme in *St. Cyprian*, and might have been interpreted an Excommunication for keeping due Catholique Communion in maintaining this ancient Catholique practice; and involved an interpretative obstinate rejection of the command of *Stephen* to the contrary, and consequently of his authority; and thereby a separation from the Church; which we have above proved to be Schismaticall: whereas *Stephen* did what he had done in defence of Catholique Communion and uniformity, and agreement amongst Christians in the generall observance of the ancient universall custome through the whole Church. Tenthly, hence appears in what sense Saint *Augustin* said, That this Question was not fully defined, but disputed and agitated in *St. Cyprians* time. For he can have no other meaning (if we make him speak without contradiction, as we must, and he certainly did) then

then this; that the speculative Reasons alledged against this practice, were agitated amongst many, though the practice were certain; yet it was for those Reasons denied to be Apostolicall by some: The last determination therefore added to it, was that of the Council of *Nice*, wherein this practice was embraced as an Apostolicall Tradition, and declared to be such to the whole Church.

And hence your Argument is fully solved, by shewing that *St. Cyprian* had been exceedingly blame-worthy, had he excommunicated others for dissenting from him in this matter then called into question by him; and *Stephen* blamelesse for excommunicating those, who violated (as he then most truly thought and taught) to be an Apostolicall Tradition and Divine truth. For if the questioning by some few the universall and immemoriall Customes of the Church, could be a sufficient reason to obstruct the exercising the full observance and belief of them, the gate will be laid open to all uncertainties; and all constancy in Christian Practices and Faith will be shaken.

Though therefore the Decree of the  
Generall

Generall Councell of Nice had not been yet enacted, yet the truth of this question was found out, as St. *Austin* acknowledges in the foresaid words, and is made manifest by *Dionysius* and Saint *Hierome* above cited; and all the Bishops both of the East and *Africa*, who had adhered to *Firmilian* and St. *Cyprian*, discovered and revoked their error, and reunited themselves to *Stephen*, and to the Christian world, (as St. *Augustin* sayes) adhering to him. And all this was effected (as St. *Hierome* witnesses) by the force of the universall practice observed amongst their Predecessours. *Hieronym. contra Lucifer. vers. finem. Denique illi ipsi Episcopi qui rebaptizandos cum eo (Cypriano) statuerant, ad antiquam consuetudinem revoluti, novum emisere decretum. Quid facimus? ita & nobis majores nostri, & illis sui tradidere majores.* “Lastly, saith “St. *Hierome*, those very Bishops, who “had decreed with him, (St. *Cyprian*) “returning again to their ancient Custom, published a new Decree. What “do we? Thus our Predecessours delivered to us, and theirs to them, to  
“wit,

“ wit, to those who denied Rebaptiza-  
“ tion. This truth therefore having been  
so fully discovered, and professed by all  
the Bishops and people of the visible  
Church, even before the Councell of  
*Nice*, what Christian can doubt, that it  
had been not onely *insolent madness* (as  
*St. Augustin* affirms) to question, or  
dispute against it, but no less then the  
crime of Heresie obstinately to contra-  
dict it; and consequently that before  
the Councel of *Nice*, there was sufficient  
ground given to Excommunicate any,  
who after this agreement of the whole  
Christian world, should have either Re-  
baptized Heretiques, or maintained, that  
they were to be Rebaptized. Nay, even  
before this truth was so fully discovered  
and universally agreed upon by all par-  
ties, seeing it was most manifest, that  
it had been not many years before uni-  
versally practised and believed by all the  
Bishops of the visible Church, though  
some few moved speculative difficulties  
against it, which startled others, not  
being well able to solve them at the first  
hearing; yet the contradicting that uni-  
versall practice and belief, upon the meer

Pro-

566 *The sixth Misconceit discovered.*

Proposition of new difficulties (according to the Maximes of true Church-Government) required both a command to have that practice observed, and an Excommunication of those who pertinaciously infringed that command.

**SECT.**

## SECT. 7.

## ¶ The seventh Misconceit discovered.

C. 10.

**W**E end our answer, to all you have yet replied, with the addition of your last Misconceit. (You affirm, that *St. Cyprians* fore-cited words accuse *Stephen* the Pope as Schismaticall, for excommunicating those Bishops, who held Rebaptization of Heretiques: wherein the thing it self is true, viz. that some for holding too peremptorily that error were excommunicated by him, viz. those of the East, and amongst the rest, as we have said, *Firmilian*, which is sufficiently proved by the words of *Firmilian* cited by you: But to affirm, that any Catholique Bishop of those times, (not involved in that Excommunication) or near them, or ever since, accounted *Pope Stephen* a Schismaticque, is one of the highest Misconceits, not to say, untruths, that could fall from the pen of any Christian. For if *Stephen* were accounted a schismaticque

568 *The seventh Misconceit discovered.*

matique for that Excommunication, why is he so highly commended by *Vincentius Lirinensis* (who could not be ignorant of it) in the whole carriage of that affair? Why did *Dionysius Alexandrinus* intercede to him for the absolution of *Firmilian*, and those of the East of his party, as witnesseth *Eusebius libr. 7. Histor. cap. 4.* and *St. Hierome de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis, in Dionysio*. And why did the whole Church, save some few tainted with that error, and excommunicated by him for it, communicate with him? Nay, why did *St. Cyprian* himself that implacable detester of Schisme, and his Colleagues continue to their very deaths in his Communion? seeing they knew it was Schismaticall to communicate with Schismatiques? And certainly *St. Cyprian* for his part was as ready to have suffered Martyrdom, rather then to have communicated with a Schismaticque, as he was, and did gloriously suffer it, rather then to relinquish the Christian Faith.

To that which you urge from *St. Austins* words, *libr. 2. cap. 6. &c.* of *St. Cyprian* and his Colleagues being Schismatiques,



*The seventh Misconceit discovered.* 569

tiques, If they had excommunicated their Brethren for denying Rebaptization, &c. We answer, that it is very true, that they had been Schismatiques in that case *initiativè* and *occasionaliter* at least, not, as you imagine, precisely for an unjust Excommunication *ut sic*, or under that sole notion, but because St. Cyprian and his party could not have excommunicated those of the contrary opinion, without separating himself, in those circumstances wherein he then was from the whole visible Church, which communicated with Stephen, and all the other Catholick Patriarchs, even in the contrary doctrine and practice. So that the others with Cyprian being but a party, and having all the chief Pastours and their flocks against them, would presently have brought a Schisme into the Church, as being a siding with one party against the body of the whole Church. For whosoever in this case had been cast out of the Church by St. Cyprian, would presently have appealed to his higher Prelates and Patriarchs, that he was excommunicated for communicating with them and theirs: and they must have vindicated him against St. Cyprian

570 *The seventh Misconceipt discovered.*

prian and his party, and commanded them to restore him again to Communion: which if he had obstinately refused, and rejected their Authority, he had separated himself from the whole Church, and so become a formall Schismaticque.

To excuse your selves from saying, that Stephen was a Schismaticque, you answer, that one act Schismaticall, or of formall Schisme, is not enough to produce an habit, or to denominate one a Schismaticque; because habits are acquired by frequentation of acts: and no man is said to be a Drunkard, *v. gr.* for having been once drunk. But, first, this doctrine relisheth much more of Morall Philosophy, then of true Divinity. For though it proceed in acquitted naturall, and morall habits, yet it ha's no place at all in infused supernaturall habits; such as that of Christian Faith, Hope, Charity, &c. are. For who can deny, that whosoever elicits one act of true Faith, is not truly denominated *Fidelis*, one of the Faithfull? or he who exerciseth one act of Charity, or Love of God, is not *Amicus Dei*, Gods friend and childe of God.

God? and contrariwise, these Habits are lost by every mortal sin of Infidelity, Heresie, or Hate of God; and by those very acts, which destroy the said supernaturall Habits, one is truly denominated an Infidell, an Heretique, an Enemy of God, &c. otherwise it would follow, that one might for want of frequentation of acts, neither be reckoned amongst the faithfull, nor amongst the unfaithfull; that one might be neither a friend, nor an enemy of God, &c. In like manner every formall act of Schisme makes one a formall Schismaticque; otherwise one might be in denomination a Christian, and commit a formall Act of Schisme, v. gr. of separation from the Church, and yet be neither Catholique nor Schismaticque. Seeing therefore you accuse *Stephen* of an act of formall Schisme, you must make him a Schismaticque. Secondly, though this your doctrine of Habits had been true, yet you fail in the application of it: For you, in your principles, must confesse, that *Stephen* committed not one onely, but many and very many acts of Schisme, both in assuming a power over his Brethren, not due to him, and  
in

572 *The seventh Misconceit discovered.*

in using it tyrannically, and in giving decrees and commands against the freedom of the Bishops, and in excommunicating so many Churches and persons, and in proceeding so inhumanely with the Legates sent to him, &c. and in continuing, reiterating, and confirming these and the like acts many times over.

The Lines, which next follow, are spent in a sole repetition of what had been said and cited before, and we answered. To prove, that some Christian pen had accounted Pope *Stephen* a Schismaticque; you cite *St. Cyprian, Epist. 74.* we answered, that those words, *Sacerdotes Dei*, &c. are not in *Erasmus* his Edition; and so no certain proof. You say, he was, according to *St. Cyprian, A friend of Heretiques; and consequently of Schismaticques; and so by being a friend of Schismaticques communicates with them, and by that communion became a Schismaticque*: and yet, though we count one another schismaticques, we doubt not but you are our friends, and we hope you think the same of us, without all communion able to make one another schismaticques. Thirdly, you say, that  
St.

St. Cyprian kept communion with Firmilian, though we account him Excommunicated. Therefore why might he not keep communion with Stephen, though he accounted him a *Scismaticque*? We answer, That we read of no other communion betwixt Firmilian and St. Cyprian, then sending a Message, and receiving a Letter; and that might have been done, before St. Cyprian understood of Firmilians Excommunication, by reason of the great distance of place betwixt them. Now after St. Cyprian received that Epistle, perceiving that he held the error of the *Quarto decimani* in it, and expressed himself so uncharitably and disrespectfully against Stephen (as we have shewed) it is not unlikely, that he cut off all further correspondence with him: Beside, if he had continued it by Letters onely, and Messages, it had not been (at least in those dayes) forbidden by virtue of Excommunication. Do not we familiarly write and send messages to you, (though we esteem you Excommunicated) and yet conceive not, that we communicate with you?

You say farther, as touching *Lirinenfis*  
his

574 *The seventh Misconceit discovered.*

his commendation of *Stephen* in this point, that it is not expressed in him (what we say) that he commends him in the whole carriage of that affair. We answer, That when a Prudent and Pious Historian, throughly informed of what he writ, and not far distant from those times (as *Lirinenfis* is known by all to be) absolutely commends a person, and that highly, in the carriage of an affair, without taking the least notice of any gross defect, Injury, Tyranny, &c. committed in it, notorious to the whole world, as the Schismaticall proceeding of *Stephen* had been, if your assertion were true, he is to be understood, that he carried himself laudably in the whole affair: otherwise such an Historian would be judged partial, and unworthy of credit; which no man will venture to say of *Lirinenfis*. Moreover, (what you deny) he expressly commends him in that very point wherein you except against him: For he praises him for making that Decree and Command, *Nihil innovetur, &c.* This Decree he sent to *Africa*, with obligation to have it put in execution and obeyed. For otherwise it had  
been

been foolish to have sent a Decree to those, who, he thought, had no obligation to obey it. Now this Decree must be judged by you unjust and Tyrannical, because it deprived those African Bishops of that freedom and liberty, which every one of them had to follow his own *dictamen* in matters not yet defined. Therefore *Lirinenfis* praised him in that very thing, which you condemn in him. Now, as I have said, *Lirinenfis* could not rightly praise *Stephen* for doing that, which was beyond his power, and injurious to the Ecclesiastical power of other Bishops: Therefore the making such a Decree, and sending it to the African Bishops, was within his power: and if he had power to enact this Law, and institute this Decree, those to whom he sent it, as his Law and Decree, were obliged to obey it; and in case of disobedience, pertinacity, and contempt, he who had power to make that Law, had power to punish them for that disobedience: and if the disobedience had gone so far as it required and deserved Excommunication, he had also power to Excommunicate them, and all this before any full determination was made



576 *The seventh Misconceipt discovered.*

made of this point by any generall Council. Stand to *Lirinenfis* his authority; and answer, we pray you, punctually this difficulty.

Next you come to *Dionysius Alexandrinus*, who (first) you say, *might intercede for these Bishops, as to an angry man, to pacifie his wrath.* But what need had either *Dionysius*, or those Bishops, to have regarded, whether *Stephen* were angry, or well pleased, if he had nothing at all to do with them, nor no more power over them, then they over him? What wise man would supplicate any one, much lesse every one for himself, or others, whom he knows to be wrongfully and undeservedly offended with them, and of whom one hath no dependance at all? Secondly, you say it appears not, that this supplication was made for *those Bishops*, but for *those things*, or proceedings of *Stephen*, because it is not  $\upsilon\ \pi\epsilon\sigma\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\upsilon$ , but  $\pi\epsilon\sigma\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\upsilon$ : As though the supplication made for others, were not concerning them; or as though we may not supplicate another as well concerning persons as things. Beside, seeing in the forementioned letter of *Stephen* to those of *Cappadocia*,

*The seventh Misconceit discovered.* 577

*docia*, &c there is no diverſity of things mentioned, but onely of *Bishops* and countries, that  $\pi\epsilon\pi\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\upsilon$  muſt neceſſarily be referred to the perſons there mentioned, as it is expreſſed in the Latine tranſlation, *Ut pro omnibus his Episcopis*, &c. Moreover the word  $\delta\epsilon\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$  ſignifying, as Lexicons render that verb, *Indigeo*, *rogo*, *ſupplifico*, *deſidero*, *careo aliquâ re*, *convenio aliquem*, *quarito*, *requiro*, *ſupplex deprecor*, *eſt mihi opus*, *imploro*, *poſtulo*, *cupio*, *peto*, *oro*, *volo*, *obſecro*, *flagito*, *exoro*, *precibus utor*, *ſum indignus*, *ſum inferior*, *ſum pauper*, *expeto*, *precibus contendo*, *veniam oro*; it muſt conſequently here ſignifie, (as I have already noted) that one ſtands in need, or is neceſſitated to have recourſe to him by an humble and ſubmiſſe petition, as to a perſon of an higher rank and dignity, and who hath power to aſſiſt me in this my humble recourſe to him. Though therefore it were referred to the precedent things before mentioned by *Dionyſius*, yet becauſe it is, as you have put it  $\alpha\pi\iota\upsilon\tau\omega\upsilon$ , that is, *all, and every of them*, it muſt comprehend alſo, that Excommunication inflicted by *Stephen* upon the ſaid *Bishops*; and ſo muſt be a ſupplication to *Stephen*, that he would

578 *The seventh Misconceit discovered.*

remit that Excommunication to the said Bishops, being now penitent and revoking their error, as he had said before. Whence appears, that your interpretation, that this was onely to move *Stephen*, to retract his act, which you suppose was injurious, tyrannicall, and schismaticall, is far from the matter: for then he should not have submissly supplicated him, but justly expostulated with him; especially, if he were a person having no authority at all over those, whom he had injured as you esteem *Stephen* to have had none. For we think, you your selves would be very far now, to send an humble supplication to the Pope, to retract the excommunication, which he hath laid upon you and your Brethren, either for your selves, or for them; or be content, that any other person in union with the Pope, should send the like supplication to him in your behalf. This supplication therefore supposes an acknowledgement of *Stephens* Authority over *Dionysius*, and over all those, in whose behalf he wrote it, if they knew it, or consented to it.

To our generall Answer to your Authority,

*The seventh Misconceit discovered.* 579

thority, you onely deny what we said, without giving any other reason, then by alledging a Text of St. Augustin, much like to the former, to which we have answered, and to which our said Answer reaches. For there St. *Augustin* disputes *à minore ad majus*, that if St. *Cyprian* were so far from Schisme, that he would not give the least *occasion* to it by abstaining others from himself, they were wholly inexcusable, for the very same reason, to commit formall Schisme *in separating themselves* from the whole Church; wherein we constitute the essence of Schisme, and Saint *Augustin* with us.

Thus we have endeavoured to return the foresaid Misconceits to that origin, from whence (as we conceive) they first issued: and thereby wholly disenabled your instance of *Firmilian*, grounded in them, from giving any the least support to your definition: and could wish a speedy dispatch of these indirect discourses, to make a ready passage to the main Controversie.

---

*This is the end of our last reading, concerning their Argument drawn from the example of Firmilian, to which we never yet (having expected above a twelve-moeth) have received any Answer at all from our Adversaries.*

---

Schisme uninaskt.

*In a Recapitulation of the  
chief Passages, wherein  
may be seen in brief the  
Sum of what hath passed  
in this Conference.*

**W**E think it now necessary  
to collect into a short  
Abridgement (accord-  
ing to our agreement)  
the issues of each different Head in this  
Conference, and behold, as it were, at one  
view, what hath been so largely dispersed  
in the former debates, and drawn out at  
length by force of incident disputes, that  
such Readers, as are not versed in Logi-  
call Contentions, or Metaphysicall For-  
malities, may be rendered capable of the  
substance in each precedent difficultie, by  
a plain and easie explication of them,  
which shall be performed by a referring  
the Reader distinctly in each of them, to  
the Pages in this printed Treatise, where-

in they are respectfully delivered.

In the first Section of the first Chapter it appears, page 1. That the question *whether of us two are Schismaticques*, was stated by the Protestant Disputants, and so acknowledged to be their question; the declining of this main, and direct question to the definition of Schisme was also theirs, as appears p. 2. Prot. 2. The Definition of Schisme given by the Catholiques, was allowed as a true Proposition by their Adversaries, p. 2. The Cath. Defendants presently offered to return to the main question, and were not admitted to it by the Prot. Disp. who proceeded in the opposition of the Cath. Definition, p. 2. Cath. 3. and p. 3. Prot. 4. whence undeniably appears, that this whole Dispute upon the indirect question of the definition of Schisme, and diversion from the main question proceeded originally from the Prot. Disputants.

In the same Section, their Argument drawn from *just Excommunication*, as being a voluntary Separation of one part from the whole true visible Church of Christ, p. 3, 4. and so contained under our definition, is convinced to be a pure fallacy, both because



because *one part* in the definition of schism is taken by all, as related to the part separating onely, p. 5, 6, 7, 8. And the word *voluntary* signifies in the definition of Schisme, not onely a free, but an *irrationall, passionate, and causelesse* separation, p. 11. c. 8. such as no just Excommunication can be; and the word *separation*, a compleat, and positive separation p. 12. 13. where one part opposes and rejects the other, from whom they separate, which is not done by vertue of sole just Excommunication, and the Adversary had no other way to say any thing to our distinction of the different significations of the word *voluntary*, then by misciting our Text, and thereby bearing their Readers in hand, that we framed our distinction of the *thing signified*, when we framed it onely of the *word signifying*, or different acceptions of the word *voluntary*, as most evidently appears, by what they say in a later answer to us, (which is to be related to the first Section, as the last part of it) they speak therefore to us in this manner.

P. 1.

*And because we have upon this occasion*  
Cc. 4. *mentioned*

mentioned that your distinction, that we be not troubled again to speak to it, we will a little here examine it.

Pag. 17. We distinguish (say you) voluntary (a main ingredient into your definition) into two Classes. For voluntary is (say you) either taken in opposition to involuntary and not-free, (where you must therefore mean by voluntary, free;) or in opposition to reasonable and prudent proceeding. So that whereas you objected to us, that according to us, all mortal sins would be Schismes, which we have refuted; according to you, onely sins would be voluntary; for nothing but sin is a precipitous, heady, unreasonable, imprudent and wilful acting (as you there describe voluntary of the second acception.) But have Artists heard of such a distinction of a word into two Classes; whereof one member includes all the other within it? and yet such is here that your distinction. For if all precipitous, heady, unreasonable, imprudent, and wilful actings, and acception of things voluntary (which is your second Classis) be actual sins, as certainly they are, and all actual sins be alwaies voluntary and free (which is your first Classis,  
and

and acception of things voluntary) as sure they are, then most evidently it follows, that your first acception includes in it all of your second acception; and so very unfit to be made contradistinguishing members; unlesse Animal and Homo may be membra condidentia, or Qualitas and Virtus. V. G.

## C

You plainly miscite our words, making us say thus, viz. We distinguish (say you) voluntary (a main ingredient into your definition) into two Classes, &c. Now we say not so, but thus, To what you say of the word voluntary, we distinguish into two Classes, &c. Where you omit these two Particles the word, and thereby make us speake of voluntary, as it is the thing signified, without any relation to the word, as it hath a double signification, when we speak of that word onely as capable of that double signification. And your whole Argument against us proceeds upon this miscitation. For though it would be wholly inartificiall and illogically, to distinguish a free Act into two Classes, viz. into an Act which proceeds from free will, and an Act which

proceeds *imprudently* and *sinfully* from free will, for the reason which you give here; because in this instance the word *free act* signifies not expressly both these: yet it will be most conform to the rules of Logick, to distinguish the acceptions of the word *voluntary* into these two, because it signifies both the *Genus*, and the *Species*, that is, both *Acts* under the *genericall* notion of *free Acts*, and under the *specificall* notion of *precipitous*, *imprudent*, and *sinfull Acts*. And this being so notoriously true, that you could not deny it, how can it be illogical to affirm it? Your instances therefore of *Qualitas* and *Virtus*, &c. are of no concern here: for there is not one word nominated by you, which signifies truly and properly them both, as the word *voluntary* signifies both these things, which are attributed to it. Though therefore you mention the word *voluntary* once or twice, before you cite our words, and presently after, yet this excuses you not from a miscitation of our words *in omitting what we say*, because your whole Argument against us proceeds onely upon that miscitation, as we have now made appear: and therefore

we refer it to any equall judgement, whether you cited not our words with that omission of the word *voluntary*, to give force to your Argument, and induce your Reader to think, that we made an inartificiall and illogically distinction; at least this is evident, that either you willfully omitted those words, or urged an Argument of no force at all against us, and quite against your selves.

In the second Section, p. 14. After they had proposed their first main Argument, (to prove *That there is some other active Separation, besides that of ones self, which is truly Schisme*) in these words. *For example, Diotrephes in the Church not receiving St. John, or denying him the Communion of that Church, and denying it to the Brethren, and forbidding them that would receive them, and casting them out of the Church (and all this as loving to have the preheminence) was mortally a Schismaticque.* They contend, and that through the extent of many sheets of paper, that in this very first proposal, comprised in the foresaid words, where four different acts of *Diotrephes* are equally alledged to prove him mortally a schismaticque, that

that they proved him a schismaticke onely by the last, of casting out the Brethren, and by none of the three former; and that it might be sufficiently collected out of the tenour of these precise words of this first proposal, that they placed their Argument onely in that last act, and not in any of the former: Which how far it is from all shew of truth, every one who can understand sense will see. Now being pressed by us, to shew, to what purpose those three former acts were brought, if they were not brought as reasons of *Diotrephes* his schisme; they say, p. 25. they were instances agreed upon by both sides, and thence we infer, that they were reasons of *Diotrephes* his schisme; for we, for our parts or side, never agreed to them otherwise; pag. 26. they call them expressly *Acts or Reasons*, and pag. 27. speaking of the first act, as it was alledged by them, they call it, *that our reason*, and *an instance* also (that is a reason) of *Diotrephes* his schisme, and that they agreed with us in it, and that it was an instance (though not the principal) of the inference of their conclusion; and yet p. 32. they  
revoke.

revoke all that they said in these fore-cited places; they deny the three former acts to be *reasons of theirs*, they affirm the first to be *our* reason onely, and not theirs; and p. 27. and 48. that in all those four acts, they used onely *one reason*, to wit, *the last of those acts* in the very first proposal of this Argument, p. 37. that the other three former acts were used onely for the better understanding of the last act, and p, 38. onely as necessary to lead us, to the following words, which did contain the reason for which they alledged the example of *Distrephes*, that the three former acts are *no reasons* at all, &c. Thus with their own hand they overthrow their own work; they say the same acts were reasons, and no reasons, their reasons, and not theirs, that they gave more reasons, and yet no more but *one onely reason*; instances of *Diotrephes* his Schisme, and yet no instances of it, agreeing with us in the first three acts, and yet quite disagreeing from us, &c. Thus they play fast and loose, of and on, say and unsay, as occasion serves, because truth is so strong against them that they know not what to say.



say, and yet something they will say rather then yield to it, as we have told them p. 88. and 89. Hence we concluded that the first Proposall, must either have a conjunctive sense, that *Diotrephes* was a Schismaticque by all those acts joynd together, as partiall causes of his Schisme; or disjunctive sense, that each of them apart, was a sufficient reason to make him mortally a Schismaticque; in both which senses, each of these acts must have been reasons of his Schisme, as we say more largely, p. 66, 67. and thence we reckon up the divers defects, and inconsequences of our Adversaries, p. 89, 90, 91, 92, 93. which may be seen there. We answered therefore to this example of *Diotrephes* his Schisme, that the formall fundamentall reason which made him a Schismaticque, was his not receiving *St. John*, by which he separted himself from the whole Church, p. 15. to this they never answered; no, not when they were advertised of not answering to it, p. 16. but said, that he might be a Schismaticque for that reason, and for theirs too, i. e. for the last act of casting out the Brethren. Now this we proved to be

impossible, by our answer to this last act of casting out, &c. for that having been done onely because they *received Saint John*, as appears by the Text, 3 *John* 9. 10. must have contained a rejection of St. *Johns* Apostolicall Authority; and by that a separation from the whole Church: and therefore this casting out of the Brethren for that reason, being schismaticall, because it was a separation of *Diotrephes*, that is of ones self from the whole Church, could not be schismaticall, because it was a separation, beside that of ones self, which they undertook to prove by it, p. 14. Prot. 9. And so since it was schismaticall for our reason, it could not be schismaticall for theirs, as they were to prove it to have been schismaticall. To this reason they never yet answered. Seeing therefore no more can be evinced from the sacred Text, then that this *casting out* was schismaticall, as done because they received St. *John*; and that implies a separation of ones self, they could never prove from this example, that it had been schismaticall, if it had been done, and not for a reason implying the separation of ones self; so that this first example is void.

void and null, which was treated from p. 14. to p. 94.

In the third Section p. 95. Our Adversaries having undertaken to prove, p. 14. *That there is some active separation, beside that of ones self, which is truly Schisme.* Take for their medium this Act, *To eject others out of the Church for this sole reason, viz. for keeping due Catholique Communion, is schismaticall,* p. 25, 26, &c. We answer (*ibidem*) that such an Act is schismaticall, not as it is formally, reduplicatively, and *quæ talis*, an unjust ejection of others, but as it is an unjust rejection of Catholique Communion, and so a separation from it in him who thus ejects others; for it is not possible to conceive that any one should openly, and professedly (as *Diotrephes* did) eject others out of the Church for this sole reason, *because they keep due Catholique Communion*, and not withall be conceived to reject Catholique Communion himself; and by that rejection to separate himself from the Church, and thereby became a Schismaticque, which is our definition. If therefore they take this unjust Excommunication, onely in *sensu formali*, as it is an unjust

just Excommunication, and no further, (which they undertook to prove, and grant they take it in that formall sense onely) it is not as such schismatical. For if it were schismaticall purely *as such*, it would still remain so, though it were prescinded, and abstracted from that other formality of the *rejection of Catholique Communion*, which is contained in it, as we have now declared: and every unjust Excommunication which hath nothing at all of that *rejection*, (but consists with the union of the unjust Ejector of others, to the visible Catholique Church) would be schismatical, which can never be evinced from this Act of *ejecting others*, for this sole reason, for keeping due Catholique Communion. For there the formality of injustice is not prescinded, or separated from the formality of rejection of Catholique Communion, but adjoynd to it in one and the same Act: and therefore the addition of that rejection of Catholique Communion, was an unfit medium to prove, that that Act was schismaticall, as it was a sole unjust *ejection of others*, and for no other reason. Now to say, as they do, that every *ejection of others out of the*

the Church, for keeping due Catholique Communion, is an unjust ejection, as done for that cause; and therefore schismaticall, as it is *unjust*, or *qua talis*, is an illogically and fallacious Argument, for that reason of keeping due Catholique Communion, may either be considered generically, as it is a good, vertuous, and holy action, or as containing nothing bad in it, and so can give no just cause of Excommunication: or specifically, and formally, as it is a particular union, and adhesion to Catholique Communion; now it renders the Excommunication unjust, as it is considered generically onely, and not as it is such a *specificall* formality, or *qua talis*; for every Excommunication of others, inflicted for doing any vertuous action whatsoever, or for that which is not sinfull, will be formally unjust, whether it have the specificall notion of the keeping due Catholique Communion, or no; and by this distinction is solved all their Sylogistical Proofs dispersed in divers places of this and the following Sections, which proceed materially, as this keeping Catholique Communion is considered in its genericall notion of

a good action, &c. and not formally according to its specificall formality, or *quæ talis*. And hereby we also proved, that this foresaid act, brought as a proof of your Assertion, which was, *That some unjust separation of others was schismaticall, beside that of ones self*, was destructive of it self: for it must be to prove your said Assertion a separation, and not of ones self, and yet it is a formall separation of ones self, for that very act of ejecting others, for this sole reason, for keeping due *Catholique Communion*, as working upon this formall motive, will in *prioritate rationis* be considered as a rejection of *Catholique Communion* by the Ejectour, ere it be considered, as an unjust ejection of others, for a cause which cannot deserve that ejection, that is, for a vertuous, and holy action.

And lastly, hence appears, that as in the former Section they brought an example from *Diotrephes*, which proved him onely to be a schismaticque, because by originally dividing himself from Saint *John*, he separated himself from the whole Church, in all the ensuing acts, because all were done upon that motive; so  
here

here, to prove that there is some schismatical act beside the separation of ones self, they have brought an act, which essentially is a separation of ones self, from the whole visible Church, which rather proves the quite contrary, and helps rather, then hurts our definition.

In the first Section of the second Chapter, p, 131. we prove the Authorities of St. *Cyprian*, and St. *Hierome*, cited, p. 131. and 132. to deliver the true notion, and nature of schisme (and thereby to confirm our definition) by premising 5. *Notanda*, from p. 141. to p. 150. and confirmed them by the Authorities of the holy Fathers, which may be read there. Then we prove, that Doctor *Hammond* delivers our definition in expresse terms, from p. 151. to 155. This done from pag. 156 to 168. in the second Section, we prove our definition by most clear Authorities of other Ancient Fathers. In the third Section, from p. 169. to p. 182. we evidence it from other later Catholique Authours. And lastly, in the 4. Section, from p. 183. to 188. we manifest the truth of it from  
the



the authority of English Protestant Authors, and those the chief amongst them. To none of these have we yet received any answer, as we note, p. 188. We can give no other account of this Chapter, unless we recited the Authorities, which would be too large, and therefore we remit the Readers to them in their proper places.

They affirm in their Definition, pag. 1, 2. and in diverse other places, as p. 194, 195. 201, 202. that schisme destroyes both the Actuell Communion and unity of the visible Hierarchicall Church; and yet when they come to the last upshot of their main proof, they insist onely upon *Communion*, and make no mention of *Unity* being destroyed by unjust Excommunication. Now, as we have proved, pag. 220. 223, 224. all schisme must destroy, not the actual *Communion* onely, but the *Unity* of the visible Church; that is, schisme is of such a nature, that those, who were one Body with the Church before it, become a different and opposite Body from, and against it, by schisme: which (most evidently) is not done by the sole force of any Excommunication

nication whatsoever, whether *just* or *unjust*; for there the parts excluded from Actuall Communion with the Church, raise not themselves as opposite parties against the Church, suffering patiently that contumely (in unjust Excommunication) with hopes to be restored by just Appeals to their higher Superiours; and in the *interim* bearing a due respect and acknowledgment of the Authority of those, who unjustly excommunicated them. For as unjust Banishment of others is in it self no Sedition, or rebellion, in a Commonwealth, so is no unjust Ejection of others Schisme in the Church: which may be seen more at large in the forecited places, and pag. 207, 208. and the proof of it in the second Chapter of *Authorities*.

They grant, pag. 212, & 213. That the same person at the same time may be a reall true part, and Bishop of, and in the visible Catholique Church, and yet a true reall *Schismatique*, quite against the common judgement of all prudent Christians, as they acknowledge, pag. 255. and the clear words of St. *Augustin* cited by us, pag. 113. and never yet answered by

by them ; and generally of the Ancient Fathers. Chap. 2. Sect. 1, 2.

Pag. 321. they grant, that the Bishop of *Rome* is a true Catholique Bishop ; and ha's true Jurisdiction, at least over his own Diocess of *Rome* ; and consequently they must grant, that all those Prelates and People, who live in Communion with him , are true parts , each respectively in his degree, of the Catholique Church ; and thence will follow, that Protestants separating themselves from them, and neither living in Communion of subordination to them , nor holding Communion of coordination with them , must be formall Shismatiques.

Having been charged by us p. 312. That many of their opinions were anathematized by the Patriarchs and Bishops both of the West, and Eastern Churches in the fourth Generall Councell of *Lateran*, they endeavour by all means to discredit the Canons of that Councell, which we have proved to be authentique and legall ; and answered all they have alledged against them, from p. 325. to p. 367. our proofs were both from the testimony of the  
the

the Canons themselves, and from no reluctance of the Bishops in the Council, when they were publicly read, as Canonically consented to by them; nor after the Council was ended, ever protested against, by any of the Bishops, who sat in that Council, either of the Western, or Eastern Church, as if they had been conceived and composed by *Innocentius* the Third, and forced by him upon the Council, (as our Adversaries affirm) when the said Bishops were returned to their Sees, and had their freedom. As also because those Canons were authenticated 28 Years after the Council, by being enrolled into the publique Statute-Book of the Roman Church; that is, into the Decretalls, equally with the Canons of other Generall Councils; and because the chief Historians and School-Authors, (some whereof flourished presently after the Council (have each in his respective time mentioned and cited them, as genuine Canons of the Fourth Council of *Lateran* ever since; and lastly, because all the reasons and authorities of some Historians, which our Adversaries produce against them, never expressly deny them to

to be the true Canonickall Decrees of that Councell, or say, that the *major* part of the Bishops consented not to them; or so much as insinuate, that *Innocentius* the Pope ever went about to forge Canons of his own, and fater them upon the Councell; but onely draw their Arguments either from the want of certain Ceremonies, as subscriptions, applauses, &c. which are wanting in five or six generall Councils, as well as in this; or from this, that some of those, that were present in the Countell (whereof above 400. were no Bishops, and many of them *Lay-men*) esteemed some of the Canons grievous, or burthensome; which might be verified of those, who were not Bishops, though all the Bishops, much more the *major* part of them, had voted them, and are to be applied to the strict Canons of Discipline, (and not to the Decrees of Faith) which might seem burthensome to many, who were no great favourers of Ecclesiasticall strictness: or the words they cite, speak of some things done, either immediately before the Council, or presently after it, concerning the charges and dispatches about the holy war. The

Authority therefore of this Councell being thus vindicated, our Argument returns to its force, that English Protestants stand obnoxious to the excommunications *à jure*, pronounced against all those who maintain some of those Tenents, which are forbidden under pain of Excommunication, by all the Patriarchs, and a great number of the Bishops both of the East and West Church assembled together in a lawfull Generall Councell above four hundreds years ago.

After that we had pressed against them, that according to their principles, not onely unjust Excommunication, but unjust *suspension* and *interdict* also, would be Schisme; which was a thing so unheard of amongst all kinde of Authours, that we conceived they would never admit of that consequence, notwithstanding p. 209 they fully admit it, and stily defend it; even so far as to insert into *their formal notion* of Schisme: and when we told them, that if our definition were defective for not mentioning *separation of others*, (as they urge against us) then will theirs be defective for not mentioning *unjust suspension, interdict, &c.* but onely *separation*

paration of others from the Church, by unjust Excommunication, and that every part was to do what in them lies to conserve Communion, whether of subordination, or co-ordination: Now seeing neither of these are infringed by unjust suspension or interdict the whole extent of their definition is verified without the inclusion either of unjust suspension or interdict. And seeing, as they have said above p. 201. That every Schisme is a rent in the Church, and every rent includes at least a tearing one piece from another; and no such tearing is made by unjust suspension, or interdict, (for all parts remain united as they were before, in one Politique Body of the Church) it cannot be conceived, that unjust suspension, or interdict, should belong to the formall notion of Schisme.

They are so large in their description of Schisme p. 226. that beside that which they call *criminall Schisme* (and is indeed the onely Schisme mentioned amongst the holy Fathers; for all true and proper Schisme, according to them, separates him, who commits it, from the unity of the true Catholique Church, as we have proved, Chap. 2. Sect. 1, 2.) they consti-



tute another, which they call *venial Schisme*; which position both quite overthrow their own definition, (for it neither separates themselves nor others from the Church; for it can be no *small offence* to effect either of these separations; for want of due deliberation, or taking due information (which they alledge) will not excuse any one; because in matters of so great concern, every one hath a strict obligation to take a full-information before he proceed to an unjustice of so high a nature:) yet seeing they constitute, and could convince us (which they can never do) to be guilty of such a light Schisme as this, what would it availe them to work our conversion to them? seeing such a Schisme will be no hindrance to our salvation in that Church, wherein we are, as we have urged them in another place, but could never yet get an Answer.

Page 196, 197, 200. they cite certain Texts of Scripture for their *formall notion* of Schisme; which we answer from p. 262. to p. 269. to be either meant of Schisme taken in a large sense, (as it is *John 9.*) or for Heresie: and that the

*διχομασίας ποιήσας* there spoken of, is onely the inventing and maintaining of false doctrines against Faith, which make formally of themselves a division from the true Church.

We had said p. 314, 315. that *Hieremias* Patriarch of *Constantinople* witnesseth in his *cenfura Ecclesie orientalis*, that the present East Church agrees in all points of Controversie betwixt us and Protestants, with us against them, save onely in that of the Popes supremacy. Here they formalize upon this word in all points, and endeavour to prove that in some two or three they rather favor Protestants then us; which were it so, they must first grant, that in all the rest, which are the most substantiall and materiall, they agree with us against them; which is no small disadvantage to their cause: For by this they must confesse, that both the East and West Churches are against them in all the most high points of Controversie betwixt us. But even in those two or three small observations, which they make from *Hieremias* his epistle, his proofs fall much short of what he intends to evince from them. He cites therefore

Chap. 13. where *Hieremias* seems to say, that sins omitted through shamesfastness in confession, are pardoned with the rest. But first where is this a point of Controversie betwixt us and Protestants? Our Controversie is, whether Auricular Confession is to be practised, or no? And in that he is plainly for us in this very Chapter. What may, or may not excuse the penitent in some cases, may be a controversie betwixt *Hieremias* and us, but is none betwixt us and Protestants; till first they admit Auricular Confession, as much as the East Church admits it, which is, that to obtain the perfect remission of our sins, we must confess all our sins to our spirituall Father, with a contrite and humble heart, and all the parts of them, as far as our minde inables us, and as we can remember. And that sin covered with silence is a disease, that lies hid aen within one, as he sayes in the same Chapter, and cites for it *St. Basil* the Great. Secondly, (though we will determine nothing in so hard a matter) it may haply so fall out sometimes, that certain shamefull young creatures may be so suddenly surprized with shame, that for the present it may excuse them,

them, (as other sudden passions do in other cases) from a mortall sin, in not expressing some of their sins; and so those sins may be forgiven with the rest by Almighty God, though not directly by vertue of Priestly Absolution: And therefore *Hieremias* sayes not here, that the Ghostly Father remits such forgotten and unexpressed sins by power of the Keys, but onely that he prayes to God, that God will pardon them, and hopes they may obtain pardon: so that there remains still an obligation to confesse those very sins another time, when they return to our remembrance, or when that extream sudden passion of shame and fear is over, which then prevents reason.

Their second Objection is drawn from the Epilogue of *Hieremias*, p. 137, & 138. where he saith, That the Lutherans judge aright, in affirming, that *all* ought to receive in both kindes; and that the custome of the Greek Church is to do so. Answer, there are two things to be considered. The first, what is matter of Faith in this point, (of which we onely treat, when we say, that the East Church agrees with us against Protestants in all

points controverted betwixt Protestants and us, &c.) The second, what is matter of discipline and practice concerning Communion, which touches not our debate. Now it is evident, that *Hieremias* treats not here, that it is matter of faith to receive both, by any necessity, either *medii*, or *precepti divini*, either absolutely necessary in it self, or by divine precept to salvation alwayes for all, for then he should contradict what he sayes in the third Chapter, that a *part* of the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ is given to such as are baptized presently after Baptisme; for had it been necessary alwayes to receive both kindes, they should not give *one part*, but *two parts* of the Sacrament to them, that is, the species of bread and wine; see more of this Ceremony in *Arcuidius*, treating of Baptisme, as also that one sole species of bread is given to those who are to be married, even publicquely in the Church in the solemnization of that Sacrament in the Greek Church. He speaks therefore (as appears by his words) of publique Communion in or after Masse, which ought to be done in both kindes, so long  
as

as Ecclesiasticall governors forbid it not, as they yet do not amongst the Grecians.

Your third exception, is the permitting married persons to be made Priests, and to live according to the state of marriage after Priesthood, which is no point of faith (whereof we onely treated) and was agreed upon by the Latine Church in the Councell of *Florence*, (and so not absolutely contrary to their doctrine) and no Priest is permitted amongst them to marry after Priesthood, nor any man to live according to that state after he makes the vows of chastity in religion, (and the same is of Bishops) which is agreeable to us, and contrary unto the Protestants.

Your last exception (to our best remembrance, for you never sent us the papers of that reading) was in the matter of the *reall presence*, which is indeed a point of faith. But what you alledge *C. 10.* from *Hieremias* his words against it, is a mistake, not a proof. For when he sayes, *Neque verò, aut tunc, cum illis porrigebatur ea caro quam Dominus gerebat, in cibum dabatur Apostolis, aut sanguis in pos-*

tum, aut nunc in divinâ misteriorum administratione, tanquam corpus illud sursum translatum de cœlo iterum descendat (hoc enim blasphemum est,) &c. Neither then, when it was imparted, was that flesh which our Saviour carried about with him, given to the Apostles for meat, nor that blood for drink; or now, in the divine administration of the Mysteries, as if that body which is translated on high, descends again from heaven, (for that were blasphemous) &c. Where the second part of the sentence explicates the first, and declares that his meaning is, that this mystery happens not by locall motion, or leaving the place where he was before, but by transmutation, or transubstantiation of bread and wine into his true body and blood (as he sayes in the next following words) So that as he now leaves not his place in heaven to enter into the mouths, and become the food of Christians; so in the first institution he left not the place wherein he then visibly was, to enter into the mouths, and become the food of the Apostles. But how clear *Hieremias* is for the reall presence, and transubstantiation, will appear to any one who reads him



him in this Chapter, where he most manifestly asserts transubstantiation, and the reall presence, c. 13. p. 71. where he first distinguishes it from that bread which before consecration is dedicated or consecrated to God, and sayes, that after consecration, it becomes the true bread which came down from heaven, and by the truth of the word, is truly and really changed.

We cite next *Acta Theologorum Wittenbergensium*. You answer first, that they were not of the English Church. Secondly, that others might be amongst them of a contrary opinion, they being onely but a few Divines of one university. But whether they were precisely of the English Profession, or no; or whatsoever they might differ from others in points of religion amongst them, yet they were men of learning, and repute amongst their own, and yours, the Protestant party, and so are supposed in a matter of fact, especially which made against them, not to have related things otherwise then they were, and so to have made a true relation, that the Greek Church is contrary to you and them in the points there

there mentioned by them.

Lastly, we cite Sir *Edwin Sands* to the same purposes, to which you give no other Answer, then that you had not seen his book, which, we think, will give as little satisfaction to your Readers, as it does to our allegation of his Authority. But it seems, when you could not deny that he was of your profession, and Church, (as you did of the former) you thought best to plead ignorance, where nothing else would serve to avoid his testimony.

The sum of this long and eager contrast about the *formall notion* and nature of Schisme, and *their new acception* of the word *Church*, which we treat Chap. 3. from p. 189. to p. 414. comes in the upshot to this, That *their formall reason* of Schisme, as it is new, and never yet grounded by them, (nor ever to be grounded) in any *classique Authour*, old or new, theirs or ours, and for that alone to be suspected by all sober persons, of insufficiency: so it is wholly inconsistent with the nature of Schisme, and absolutely null in it self: which we shew thus from their own words.

They say pag. 197. print, *As sedition*

is *διχοστασία* in the State, so is Schisme in the Church; which must be taken for an universall proposition. Now all sedition is such a *διχοστασία*, or Division in the State; whereby the seditious separate themselves from the State, by a positive and formall opposition against it. *Ergo*, according to them, all Schisme must also be such a *διχοστασία* in the Church, whereby the Schismaticque separates himself from the Church by a positive and formall opposition against it, which as it makes schisme to agree with our definition, so it makes it to disagree with theirs, and the *formall reason* which they give of it, as is evident. And as they say here, that *all Schisme is διχοστασία*, so they demand pag. 201. print, thus. *What is σχίσμα (Schisme) but a rent of the unity and continuity (as it were) of that body, which before was entire?* Now a rent in politique bodies is onely then said properly to be, when there are two separate parties contending the one against the other, which before were united. For no man can say, that a sole unjust banishment, or outlawry, of persons from a secular state, is a *rent* in that state: which  
then

then onely happen, when sedition or rebellion follows upon it, either in the unjust banisher, or in those, who were unjustly banished. So neither is unjust Excommunication alone of some from the Church, *a rent* in the Church; for that onely happens, when spirituall sedition, and rebellion follows upon it, either in the unjust Excommunicatour, or in those, who are unjustly excommunicated.

Which will more clearly appear by inserting here some passages in your last papers: which through inadvertency had escaped the print. You therefore press us thus.

P.

*The next part of your discourse is raised against the perfection of our definition, which you know, and we have told you before, is not now the question. Nay, in our reply, to which in this you pretend to answer, we complained earnestly of the like desultory dealing: and yet you go on still to recriminate our definition, while you ought to apply your selves to the defence of your own.*

C.

*You are not to limit your Adversaries Mediums to strengthen his own, or to in-*  
firm:

firm your cause, as he findes fit occasion, or reason. And what contender in Logi-  
call Disputes limits the Arguments of his  
Opponents, or appoints him what *medi-  
um* he is to take? We oppose your defi-  
nition here *occasionaliter*; arguing that  
you cannot say what you affirm, because  
it is destructive of your own definition.  
Had not you given this occasion, we had  
been silent in that point. If there-  
fore your definition be impugned before  
its time, you may thank your selves  
for it.

P.

*Now as any accusation of our definition  
were in this place improper, so that which  
you here charge it with is most strange. For  
first you tell us, our comprehending unjust  
penances, corporall punishments, and  
an hundred other unjust Acts within our  
definition seem to make it of a monstrous  
extent. Thus we are accused of making  
our definition too redundant. Next you  
say, Penances, fallings, watchings, and  
corporall punishments unjustly inflicted,  
cannot be contained under any part of  
our definition, and were not expressed in  
it, when they ought to have been. And*

*So.*

so we are accused of making a definition, which is redundant, redundant and deficient in respect of the same thing. Penances and corporall punishments; that is the first objection: penances and corporall punishments are contained under no part of our definition; that is the second objection. And how we should be guilty of charges so contradictory we cannot see.

C.

*Uno absurdo dato mille sequuntur.* How ordinary is it in Logicall Disputes for an Opponent to infer contradictions from some absurd concession of his Adversary? And we wonder you saw not this to be, not onely very possible, but very ordinary. We had proved, that the act assigned by you of separating others from the Church, onely for keeping due Catholique Communion, was formally schismaticall, onely because it was done for that sole reason. Therefore, said we, every unjust act done to others for that sole reason will be schismaticall. For wheresoever the *formall reason*, or cause is, there must be the *formalis effectus* of it. Therefore we inferred unjust penances, watchings, corporall punishments, &c, inflicted for  
this

*this sole reason* will be schismaticall in the inflictour of them. Then we subsumed, but you put into your definition *the unjust separation of others*, which hitherto is proved to be schismaticall, onely because inflicted for that reason. Therefore all other unjust acts, which may be inflicted, *for that sole reason*, ought to have been nominated in it, as well as that. But if they had been all nominated, seeng hundreds of them may be reckoned up, your definition would have become monstrously redundant: *Ergo*. On the other side, though all these other unjust Acts ought, according to your concession here, to have been inserted into your definition, you have expressly inserted none, save that of unjust separation: *Ergo* your definition is deficient for wanting that monstrous redundancy, which it ought to have had according to what you here grant. So that your definition must either have been monstrously redundant, or monstrously deficient. Nay, your definition is both monstrously redundant for comprehending so great a number of acts, which *à paritate rationis* ought to have been expressed in it; and monstrously  
ly



ly deficient, because it expressees one only of those acts, which *à paritate rationis*, it ought to have expressed. What open understanding cannot easily see this? Or who sees not as clearly, that which follows next, viz. That according to what you have said here, all those acts were to have been expressed in your definition, if it had been instituted, as it should have been? and yet cannot be expressed in it, as it now is; it being supposed by you to be a compleat Definition without them.

P.

*Again you say, An hundred other acts, which in themselves alone have no violation of Church Communion were to have been expressed in our definition of Schisme; and at the same time you tell us, that they cannot be contained under any part of our definition, seeing they contain no violation of Catholique Communion, or the benefit of it; To which we answer, That whatsoever doth contain no violation of Catholique Communion, is not contained in our definition; neither can it be contained in any true definition of Schisme; because the formalis ratio*

of

of Schisme consists in the violation of Communion. And whereas you say, Those other Acts, which in themselves alone have no violation of Communion, ought to have been expressed in our definition, and render this reason, because they would be acts as truly schismaticall, as unjust separation of others is; We answer, that what you bring for a reason, is a manifest falsehood. For an unjust separation of others, is a violation of Church Communion; and those Acts which you mention, are supposed by you to have no violation of Church Communion. But it is impossible that no violation of Church Communion should be as Schismaticall, as a violation of Communion. Therefore those acts urged by you, cannot be as truly Schismaticall, as an unjust separation of others.

We reply therefore to your disjunctive objection, that our definition is not imperfect for want of those acts, which contain no violation of Church Communion, because no such acts can be truly Schismaticall: and whatsoever is not such, ought not to be contained in it. On the other side, our definition is perfected, by containing in it the unjust separation of others; because that is in it  
 self

self schismaticall: and being added to the separation of ones self, maketh up the compleat notion of Schisme. And your definition will never appear perfect, till you have added this part of ours to it.

\* As you have deferred the treating of Suspensions and Interdicts to another part of your discourse; so must we defer our answer, being forced to follow whithersoever your objections lead us.

## C

This whole Paragraph is a flat deniall of our Conclusion without answering to our premises. We contend, that though those designed acts contain no violation of Church Communion in themselves, as they are *unjust*, yet they contain it in the *formall reason*, for which they are done, namely, for keeping *due Catholique Communion*. For we have already shewed, that he, who exercises an injurious act against another, for *this sole reason*, violates Church Communion in himself, by separating of himself. Now you answer, that it is impossible, any act should be contained in the definition of Schisme, which is not a violation of Church Communion, which we say too; but you take no notice,

notice, that we deny onely, that they are such violations *in themselves*, as they are unjust, and yet are such in the *formall reason* superadded to them, for which onely they are inflicted: and this you touch not here, because it is so clear, that you cannot answer it.

And here we finde a fit occasion to answer the last Paragraph of all the papers, which we have received from you; and which was before omitted, it belongs to the *Treatise of the formall reason of Schisme*. You say therefore, as followeth.

P.

*Advert therefore, we pray you, this one thing, that this fallacy runs generally through most of your Arguments and Answers made to us, that because injustice, as injustice, is not formally Schisme, (for then all unrighteousness would be schisme) that therefore so oft as we say, or prove, that an unjust Excommunication, as such, is schismaticall, we mean, that every unjust Excommunication, as it is unjust, is schismaticall, hoc est, as it hath injustice in it. That is not it we say, but that as it is an unjust Excommunication, quatenus talis, that*

that is, as it is a formally, properly, unjust excommunication; not as it is an injustice alone, nor as an excommunication alone; for neither every injustice; much lesse every Excommunication, comes near to be schism, but every formally, properly, clearly unjust Excommunication, as it dares venture upon cutting off a member of Christs mysticall Body, and of the Ecclesiasticall Communion, being for ought as to him innocent, and a living member of Christs mysticall Body. He that dares adventure upon this, how he can be excused by you from that want of the truth of love of the neighbour, and of Ecclesiasticall Communion, by which the Fathers describe Schisme, you may please to try in your solutions of our following Syllogismes; the Answers whereof we now come to consider.

## C.

Whensoever you instance in unjust excommunication of others, in our answers we neither consider *injustice* alone, nor *Excommunication* alone, (as you here accuse us) and you should have brought somewords of ours where we did what you impose upon us, had you proceeded solidly and groundedly) but we take un-

just

just Excommunication for what it is, both together, as will appear by our Answers. For we were not so ill versed in formalities, as to deduce from your position, either that all injustice, or every Excommunication is Schisme. But taking them both together, we still contended, that no unjust Excommunication, *quà talis*, as an unjust Excommunication is Schisme. And to all that you have here said to prove it, we have answered, that unjust Excommunication, *quà talis*, makes no positive separation, or rent in the Church, no more then unjust banishment, *quà tale*, makes a positive separation, rent, sedition, or rebellion in the Commonwealth; but onely depriving others unjustly for a time of actuall Communion, destroyes not that radicall unity, which those, who are thus deprived, retain with the Church, by behaving themselves peaceably, and acknowledging the authority of their lawfull superiours, who thus deprived them. And when we alledge instances of unjust acts, which are not Excommunications, and affirm, that they must also, according to your principles, be esteemed Schisme, we alwayes joyn them to that formal motive

tive of inflicting those injustices upon others for this sole reason, *because they keep due Catholique Communion*: which motive as we have now seen, comprises the separation of *ones self* within it; and so hath the proper Notion of Schisme.

As to their *new acception* of the word *Church*, it is manifest, that they were forced to it, as a meer shift to avoid the force of our Arguments; which invincibly would have concluded against them, had they persisted to take the word *Church* in the usuall acception, wherein we both took it before, for the visible Hierarchical Church. And this they did quite contrary to their acception of the same word in the precedent words, p. 6. to which they relate in that other passage, where they quite change the acception of it into another p. 28. as we have a little above manifested.

And it is further evident, p. 422, 423, 425 that before they had said, *He also who separates others unjustly from the Church Communion, separates himself consequentially from the Church.* They cited *St. Augustin* in two or three places, pag.



423. as saying, that he who separates others unjustly from the Church, separates himself from the unity, and thereby becomes a Schismaticque. Now no separation of ones self (even as they grant) can make one a Schismaticque, unless it be an externall separation from the unity of of the visible Hierarchicall Church. *Ergo*, when they cited those words of St. *Augustin*, their opinion was, that separation of others from the externall union, separates the unjust separatour from the *externall* unity of the visible Hierarchicall Church. But seeing afterward, that they could not maintain this without granting, that all the Bishops of the Romane Church, at least were no true members of the Church for this 400. years, if this were true, and other the like consequences, they were forced to change the word *Church* into *the number of Christs lively members*.

As to the two different acceptions of the *visible* Church (which they glance at above, and say, that they delivered in a reading of Papers, *which they never sent*) viz that it is sometimes taken by the holy Fathers for the politique Body of the

E c

Church,

Church, consisting of Bishops, Pastours, and People, &c. and sometimes for the number of the Saints, or lively Members united mystically to Christ their head, under favour, we conceive, they misunderstand and misapply this distinction. For though the holy Fathers, and namely St. *Augustin*, very often take the term *Catholic Church*, for the number of Gods true children, Saints, &c. yet even when he speaks of it as such, he abstracts it not (as they do) from the politique body of the Church; for one main part of the sanctity of Gods people consists either in the due obedience to their lawfull Prelates, if they be subjects, or in the right government of their people, if they be Prelates; and in a collaterall, externall Communion in the profession of faith, and exhibition of charity amongst Prelates, and people of equall ranks and conditions: and all Saints must be parts of this politique Body of the visible Church, ere they can be Saints. So that this term *Catholick Church* even when it is used for the number of Gods children, is so far from excluding the politicall œconomy and Hierarchy of the visible Church, that it necessarily

necessarily includes it ; either as a part of it , when those Prelates and people are Gods children ; or as a *Connotate* , to which it necessarily relates , and without which it cannot subsist, nor be truly denominated the *Catholique visible Church*. For though wicked Prelates and people be no parts of the *Catholique Church* in this sense , because they are no true children of God ; yet the sanctity of Gods children necessarily relates to them , in exhibiting true obedience and reverence, even to such lawfull Prelates : and the sanctity of good Prelates relates to the due government and correction of wicked and ungracious people. So that there can be no full and compleat distinction of these two expressions , as excluding the one the other ; because the one of them includes the other : for all the lively members of Christ must be members of the visible Hierarchicall Church ; and so you fall into that very inartificiall proceeding whereof you accused us , upon your miscitation of the word *voluntary*.

When therefore you take the term *Catholique Church* in a perfect contradiction from the Hierarchicall œconomy

my administred in it, and without any necessary reference to it, (as you here must do, if you have given a Logically distinction) and abstract the internall sanctity of the lively members of Christ from this externall Government and Communion; when you take (we say) the term of *Catholique Church* in this manner, you can mean no other, then (as we truly charge you) *the invisible Church*, that is, the number of those, who have true sanctity, *as they have that, and no further*, which is a thing wholly invisible to men, and known to God onely. And the reason is, because you take this term onely, as it is a number of those, from whom one is separated by mortall sin. Now when mortall sin separates any one from the number of Christs lively members, it does it onely by vertue of that formall opposition, which it hath with true internall sanctity (as we have declared) as considered purely in it self, and without reference to any externall circumstances of government, or otherwise; and thus stands in opposition to that number of lively members, as it is onely internall, spirituall, and invisible.

When

When therefore you constitute unjust separation of others to separate onely from the number of Christs lively members, which separates not (as you grant) from the visible Church, as it is Hierarchically composed of Pastours and People, those unjust Excommunicatours remain still unseparated from the lively members of Christ, as they are members of that Politique Body: and consequently will be at the same time both *unseparated* and *separated* from those lively members: which cannot be said without a plain contradiction, unlesse you solve it with this distinction, (as we do) that they are *invisibly* separated from those lively members; it being onely known to God who are such; and *visibly* unseparated from them, as being still united to them, as parts of the same visible Hierarchicall Church. If it should be replied, that they may be *visibly* separated from the lively members of Christ, by their lives and conversations, which are so much different from those, who are true servants of Christ, that there is a visible difference betwixt them. We answer, that this objection can prove no more, then that by

the works of externall conversation can onely be gathered a difference from such as seem to be lively members of Christ, but not from all such as *really* and indeed are so. For many Hypocrites may in externall shew seem as good as Saints; and injustices may be, and are commonly done so secretly, that there is no externall evidence of them, (which may also happen in unjust Excommunications) and yet even those secret, nay internall sins, when they are mortall, separate from the lively members of Christ, truly and really, though no externall notice be taken of them. Seeing therefore this separation must be understood universally from all Christs lively members, (whereof a great number are secret and unknown) and effected by all mortall sins, which are often unknown to others; it is manifest, that the reall separation from Christs lively members and who are the lively members of Christ, is a thing wholly invisible in it self, and known onely to God, and to whom he reveals it.

In the proposition of your second Argument, Ch. 4. p. 414, 415, &c. we discover, and make good against divers misconcepts

concepts of our words, and of our Answer to the instance of *Firmilian*. As first, f. 2. p. 425, & 426, &c. you make us compare the error of *Firmilian* in rebaptizing Heretiques, onely with that of *St. Cyprian*, to infringe the authority of their words against *Stephen*; when we clearly compare their passions expressed in their Epistles against him, which passion took authority from their words: for we say of *Firmilian*, --- he writ his Epistle against *Stephen*, and in this, (that is in his Epistle) *patiebatur aliquid humani*, he fell into a humane frailty of passion, as *St. Cyprian* did in his Epistle, according to *St. Augustin*.

Sect. 2. p. 433. You affirm, that we agree with you, that *Firmilians*, and *St. Cyprians* case was the same, in order to the holding and maintaining rebaptization, &c. which we never agreed to, neither could you ever produce any words of ours, wherein we said so.

*Ibidem*, You misconceive that *Firmilian* was a holy Bishop in all things, abstracting from his error of Rebaptization, as *St. Cyprian* was. This we prove to be false, from p. 449. to 482. both be-



cause he was excommunicated with those of the East by *Stephen*, which *St. Cyprian* was not; and because he railed insufferably against *Stephen*, calling him a Schismaticque, an Heretique, worse then an Heretique, an Apostate, and as bad as *Judas*, taunting and flouting at him, which *St. Cyprian* did not: and because he held the error of the quarto decimani, which *St. Cyprian* never held.

Sect. 4. from p. 483. to p. 499. they misconceive the words of *St. Cyprian*, which we compared with those which they had cited from *Firmilian*; for we speak clearly of words written against *Stephen* by *St. Cyprian*, which are disliked by *St. Augustin*, and wherein he affirms *St. Cyprian* fell into some passion; and they take us to speak of words uttered by *St. Cyprian* in the Councell of *Carthage*, which both *St. Augustin* commends highly, as full of peace, and free from passion, and never thought to have been spoken against *Stephen* the Pope, but were to be understood onely of *St. Cyprian* himself, as Primate of *Africa*.

From p. 500. to 512. sect. 5. They misconceive that *St. Cyprian* was excommunicated

municated by *Stephen*, which though they deny they ever said, yet their words clearly affirm it; for they acknowledge that they said thus, p. 500. *That St. Cyprian justified himself, and his party against the pretense of the Popes excommunicating them:* Where the Relative *them* must be referred to all the Correlatives going before, (when no restriction is made, as here there is none) that is to *St. Cyprian*, as well as to *his party*.

Pag. 514. They misconceive that those words of Saint *Cyprian* in the African Councell, hinted *Stephen*, and were understood by *St. Augustin* as meant of *Stephen*, and yet praised by him as full of peace and charity, which is evidently untrue; for *St. Augustin* understands them of *St. Cyprian*, and seeing he disliked other words of *St. Cyprians* Epistle, which were inveying against *Stephen*, as relishing of passion, how could Saint *Augustin* have praised these other, and esteemed them full of peace, had he understood them to have carped at *Stephen*, unlesse he were contrary to himself, and liked in one place, what he disliked in another.

The last Misconceit, wherewith we

Ee 5, charge

charge them, is accusing Pope *Stephen*, that Holy Confessor, and Martyr, whose Feast is celebrated the second of *August*, both by the Western, and Eastern Church, an honour not given but to persons of admirable sanctity, and who have exceedingly well deserved of the whole Church, to be a Schismaticque: This holy Pope was highly praised by St. *Augustin*, extolled by *Vincentius Lirinensis*, commended by the very Donatists themselves, though so much their enemy, revered, and supplicated by *Dionysius* Patriarch of *Alexandria*, adhered to by St. *Cyprian*, and followed by the Christian world in his tenet against Rebaptization; and lastly acknowledged to have maintained the Catholique truth, by all those who opposed it, and him: and yet because one onely *Firmilian*, fallen into error, transported by passion, enraged by Excommunication, accuses *Stephen* to be a Schismaticque, this *No-authority* must prevail so much with our adversaries, as to oversway all the rest, and bear the world down, that Pope *Stephen* was a Schismaticque, even whilst St. *Augustin* excuses him expressly from Schisme, and they themselves

selves confesse that St. *Cyprian* lived in Communion with him; and no<sup>t</sup> Authour not excommunicated, ever accused him of Schisme; and condemn us exceedingly, for affirming *Firmilian* to have incurred Excommunication, and to have deserved it. Judge Reader, where is now their Charity?

But if they will have *Stephen* a Schismaticque, because he is branded with that title by *Firmilian*, why say they not likewise, that he was an Heretique, and worse then an Heretique, and an Apostate, and as bad as *Judas* himself, because in the same heat of passion he was so reviled by *Firmilian*? And when all is done, the whole passage of *Firmilian* helps them nothing; for he never sayes expressly, that *Stephen* became a Schismaticque, by excommunicating others unjustly, as they were to prove from him, but sayes expressly, that men became Schismaticques, by apostatizing from the Ecclesiasticall unity, which is our very definition of Schisme. And to be sure to prove nothing by this example, they themselves deprive it of all that small shew of proof, which at the first proposal it might seem to carry with it, both by

by interpreting (when they were prest by occurring difficulties) the word *all*, *thou hast cut off thy self from all*, of those onely whom he opposed by Excommunication, for that is not to cut himself off from the whole visible Church, and by apostatizing from the Ecclesiasticall unity of the internall unity alone, which is done by every mortall sin, as well as by Schisme, and so is no effectuall sign, or proper sequell of Schisme; so that this Argument from *Firmilian* will have no more force then this. I prove that *Stephen* was a Schismaticque, because he excommunicated others unjustly, because *Firmilian* sayes, that *Stephen* excommunicated others unjustly, which is just *idem per idem*.

Other particulars there are comprized in this Chapter, which for brevity sake we omit, (to avoid impropotion in so small a Volumn) referring the Reader to the Index, where they shall be expressed. And we come to the decision of the main question, by proving English Protestants to be Schismaticques, separating themselves from the whole true visible Church of Christ.

*Schisme*

## *Schisme unmaskt.*

In a decision of the main  
Question, that En-  
glish Protestants are  
Schismatiques.

### *The first Argument.*

**W**Hosoever make a voluntary separation of themselves from the whole true visible Church of Christ, are Schismatiques.

But all those of the English Protestant party, make a voluntary separation of themselves from the whole true visible Church of Christ.

Therefore all those of the English Protestant Party are Schismatiques.

The first Proposition is evident, & granted by our Adversaries above, p. 1. when they allowed our definition to be a *true Proposition*. We prove the second Proposition. Who-

Whosoever voluntarily separate themselves from all particular visible Christian Churches in the world of the same time with them, make a voluntary separation of themselves from the whole true visible Church of Christ.

But all those, who are of the English Protestant Party, voluntarily separate themselves from all the particular visible Christian Churches in the world of the same time with them.

Therefore all those of the English Protestant Party make a voluntary separation from the whole true visible Church of Christ.

The first Proposition is manifest: for in the extent of all the true visible Christians Churches in the world, must be contained the whole true visible Church of Christ. The second Proposition we prove.

Whosoever voluntarily separate themselves from the present Eastern and Western Churches, and all Churches in their Communion, voluntarily separate themselves from all the particular Christian visible Churches in the world, of the same time with them.

But all those of the English Protestant



staut Party voluntarily separate themselves from the present Eastern and Western Churches, and all Churches in their Communion.

Therefore all those of the English Protestant Party, voluntarily separate themselves from all the particular visible Christian Churches in the world, of the same time with them.

The first Proposition is certainly true. For no Assembly or Congregation of Christians can be named (which is not manifestly Hereticall) that is not contained in this Proposition: we prove the second by enumeration.

If they do not so separate themselves, let that Church be nominated amongst the forementioned, from which they do not voluntarily separate themselves. It is not (confessedly) the Roman; for they all professe themselves not to be of her Communion: Nor the Greek under obedience to the Patriarch of *Constantinople*; for they have as little dependance, or agreement with that, either in Doctrine, Subjection, Discipline, Rites, or Communion, as they have with the Romane; as we have seen above in the *Recapitulati-*

*on* : where our Adversaries could instance in no more, save four Points, wherein they seemed to agree with Protestants against us; and those either not of faith, or clearly mistaken, or not as they are controverted betwixt us. And the same reason proceeds of all Churches in actuall Communion with them. *Ergo* the second Proposition is true.

It will avail nothing to alledge here, that English Protestants communicate with many other reformed Churches beyond Sea; for all those are comprehended under our terms the *English Protestant Party*; and it is as evident, that each of those voluntarily separate themselves from all other Churches, as it is, that these of *England* separate.

Neither will it excuse them to say, that they onely refined that Church, which they found corrupted and defiled; which notwithstanding remains still amongst them the very same in substance that it was before. For it is evident, that all of them, whether English or others, separated themselves from all those Nationall Churches and the Pastours of them, who were in quiet possession of Church-government.

vernment immediately before they begun, rejected in all Countries respectively, where they entred, their Authority, dispossessing them of their Sees and cures, intruding themselves into their places, and gathering tumultuously among themselves particular Congregations and Conventicles, instituting new and unheard of Rites and Ceremonies, without dependance of any, who were in possession of Church-government immediately before them through the whole world: and all this as notoriously, and undeniably as any Schismaticques ever did before their time: in all which particulars we appeal to the Historians on both parts, who have writ the Records of these two last Ages.

*The second Argument.*

Whosoever adhere to Schismaticall Pastours (*as Schismaticall* is understood in our definition) are Schismaticques.

But all English Protestants adhere to Schismaticall Pastours, as *Schismaticall* is understood in our definition.

Therefore all English Protestants are Schismaticques.

The

The first Proposition is evident. For those being onely such, as separate themselves from the whole true visible Church of Christ, all who adhere to them, must also separate with them, and thereby become Schismatiques. The second Proposition we prove.

Who soever adhere to those, who are successively ordained by such Schismaticall Pastours, maintaining the same cause which they begun, adhere to Schismaticall Pastours, as *Schismaticall* is understood in our definition.

But all English Protestants adhere to those, who were successively ordained by such Schismaticall Pastours, maintaining the same cause which they begun.

Therefore all English Protestants adhere to schismaticall Pastours, as *schismaticall*, is understood in our definition.

The first Proposition needs no proof, as being clear *ex terminis*: The second, viz. that those, whom we say were so ordained, maintain the same cause, which was begun by those who ordained them, is also clear: it remains therefore onely to prove, that they were ordained successively by Schismatiques, understood in the

For the sense of our definition: which we thus prove.

Whosoever adhere to those, who were successively ordained by *Matthew Parker*, and the other first Protestant Bishops of his time, adhere to those, who were successively ordained by such Schismaticall Pastours.

But all English Protestants adhere to such, as were successively ordained by *Matthew Parker*, and the first Protestant Bishops of his time.

Therefore all English Protestants adhere to those, who were successively ordained by such schismaticall Pastours.

The second Proposition is clear, and confessed by all: we thus prove the first.

If *Matthew Parker*, and the rest were such schismaticall Pastors, then whosoever adhere to those, who were ordained by them, adhere to those who were ordained successively by such Schismaticall Pastors.

But *Matthew Parker*, and the rest were such Schismaticall Pastours.

Therefore all those, who adhere to those, who were successively ordained by them, adhere to those who were ordained by such Schismaticall Pastours.

The

The first Proposition is clear: we prove the second.

Whosoever either possess the Sees and Offices of lawfull Bishops, those lawfull Bishops yet living, or unite themselves to such as possess them, are such schismatical Pastours.

But *Matthew Parker*, and other first Protestant Bishops of his time, either possess the Sees and Offices of lawfull Bishops, those lawfull Bishops yet living, or united themselves to such as possess them.

Therefore *Matthew Parker*, and all the first Protestant Bishops of his time, were such schismaticall Pastours.

The first Proposition is evident of itself. The first part of the second Proposition, That the Sees, &c. of living Bishops were possess'd, and that others of these new Bishops united themselves to such as possess them, is also clear, as matter of fact, out of *Stow*, *Speed*, *Cambden*, *Mason*, *Goodwin*, *Fern*, &c. The second part, viz. that those living Bishops were lawfull Bishops, even when they were deprived, we prove thus.

Whosoever were once lawfull Bishops,  
and

and never did any thing after, whereby they became unlawfull, remained still lawfull Bishops.

But those deprived Bishops were once lawfull Bishops, and never did any thing after, whereby they became unlawfull.

Therefore those Bishops remained still lawfull Bishops.

The first Proposition is evident. The first part of the second Proposition, *viz.* that they were once lawfull Bishops, we prove thus.

No National Church can be a true particular Church of Christ, unlesse those, who have the place of Bishops in it, be lawfull Bishops.

But the Nationall Church of *England* in *Queen Maries* time was a true particular Church of Christ.

Therefore those, who had the place of Bishops in it, were lawfull Bishops. Now I subsume. But those, who had then the place of Bishops in that Nationall Church, were those deprived Bishops: *Ergo.*

The first Proposition is clear. For no true Church can unite it self to unlawfull Pastours. The second Proposition is also clear



clear from the confession of our Adversaries, who grant now at last thus much, That the Church of *Rome*, and all those of her Communion are true Churches of Christ. See *Bramhall* and *Fern* upon this Subject.

We prove now the second part of the second Proposition, that those Bishops did nothing, whereby they became unlawfull Bishops.

If those lawfull Bishops did any thing, whereby they became unlawfull Bishops, it must be supposed to be that for which they were deprived.

But that for which they were deprived, did not make them unlawful Bishops.

Therefore they did nothing, whereby they became unlawfull Bishops.

The first Proposition seems evident. For no prudent man can suppose, that they would deprive them for that which made them not unlawfull Bishops if they had been convinced to have done any other thing, which might make them unlawfull Bishops. The second we prove.

All the reasons, for which they were deprived, was resisting the pretended Reformation,

formation, and refusing the Oath of Supremacy.

But those could not make them unlawfull Bishops: Therefore the causes, for which they were deprived, could not make them unlawfull Bishops.

The first Proposition being matter of fact, is witnessed by *Camden, Goodwin,* and others; the second Proposition we prove thus.

No proceeding in practice, according to the common Tenets, the holding whereof made them not unlawfull Bishops, can make them unlawful Bishops.

But resisting the pretended Reformation, and refusing the Oath of Supremacy, was onely a proceeding according to the common Tenets, the holding whereof made them not unlawfull Bishops.

Therefore resisting that Reformation, and refusing that Oath could make them no unlawfull Bishops.

The first Proposition is clear in it self: for no man can be thought to become an unlawfull Bishop, *verbi gratiâ*, by praying for the souls in Purgatory, if the holding that such prayers are lawfull, make him not an unlawful Bishop; and so of the rest.

The

The second Proposition is also evident. For whilest they were lawfull Bishops in Queen *Maries* time, they held it a common necessary point of Religion to resist that reformation, and refuse that Oath of Supremacy.

If it should be replied, that as the Queen had power to deprive lawful temporall Officers at her pleasure, so might she also deprive at her pleasure lawfull Ecclesiasticall Officers and Bishops, as being no lesse chief Governour of the Church, then of the Commonwealth; we answer, that even that admitted (not granted) yet this second she could not do: For the Kings and Queens of *England* pretended onely to succeed into those prerogatives of Church-government, which the Pope had before them, as is clear in King *Henry* the 8<sup>th</sup>: But the Pope himself had no power to dispossess a lawfull Bishop remaining a lawfull Bishop at his pleasure. Therefore neither had the Queen any such power.

*The third Argument.*

We prove in this Argument by another *medium*, that *Matthew Parker* and his Associates, and consequently all who adhered to them, or adhere to their Successors, were, and are Schismatiques, separate from the whole true visible Church of Christ.

*Matthew Parker* was a Schismaticque, voluntarily separate from the whole true visible Church of Christ.

Therefore all those, who were willingly consecrated by him, and all their Successors and Adherents were such Schismatiques.

The Consequence is clear, as appears in the former Argument: The Antecedent we prove.

Whosoever was willingly consecrated by Schismatiques, voluntarily separate from the whole true visible Church of Christ, is himself a Schismaticque, voluntarily separate from the whole true visible Church of Christ.

But *Matthew Parker* was willingly consecrated by Schismatiques, voluntarily

F f

sepa-

separate from the whole true visible Church of Christ.

Therefore *Matthew Parker* was a Schismaticque, voluntarily separated from the whole true visible Church of Christ.

The first Proposition is already proved. For to be willingly consecrated by such Schismaticques is schismaticall, and therefore separating from the whole true visible Church of Christ.

The second Proposition we prove, as matter of fact.

*Goodwin* in the different lives of *Barlow*, *Coverdale*, *Scory*, and *Hodgkins*, who were the Consecrators of *Parker*, acknowledges, that the three first were possessed of the Sees and Offices of other Catholique Bishops living: *Barlow* was intruded into the place of *Christopherson*, Bishop of *Chichester*, Decembr. 20. Anno 1559. and elect to it, before he consecrated *Parker*, as appears by the Queens letters, *Gulielmo Barloo, nunc Cicestrensi electo*. *Scory* was put by King *Edward* the 6<sup>th</sup> into *Day's* place, then being Bishop of *Chichester*. *Coverdale* into *Vacey's* place by King *Edward* the 6<sup>th</sup>. Aug. 30. Anno 1551, which *B. Vacey* was forced to resign,

resign, as appears by this, that he was willing to be restored, (as he was afterwards) by Queen *Mary*: *Hodgkins* was onely a suffragan; but communicated with these three in this consecration; and thereby became a Schismaticque.

*The last Argument.*

Whosoever subject themselves unto these, as to their lawfull Pastours, who have no true jurisdiction over them, are Schismaticques.

But English Protestants, ever since Queen *Elizabeths* time; have subjected themselves to those, as to their lawfull Pastours, who have no true jurisdiction over them.

Therefore English Protestants, ever since Queen *Elizabeths* time, are Schismaticques.

The first Proposition is clear, from *2 Tim. 4. 3.* where describing Heretiques and Schismaticques, *St. Paul* sayes, *Ad sua desideria concervabunt sibi Magistros, &c.* according to their own fancies they shall heap up Teachers, or Masters, that is, confusedly and tumultuously, without

power or authority, without head or foot. And from *Rom. 10. 15. Quomodo predicabunt, nisi mittantur?* How shall they preach, unless they be sent? For their adhering to such, supposes the rejection of all those who are legally authorized to govern them, which is formal Schisme.

The second Proposition we prove by Enumeration.

They could not have true jurisdiction over the particular Bishopricks and Cures of *England*; neither by the force of Orders which they received, (if they had any such) for one may have true Order without any true jurisdiction, as appears in the Act of King *Henry* the 8<sup>th</sup>. concerning Suffragans, who had true Episcopall Order, and yet had no Episcopall Jurisdiction, as the Act expressly says; and many are made Ministers in the Universities, before they have any jurisdiction over any particular Parishes. Neither could they have it from themselves, as appears, *Hebr. 5. 4. Nec quisquam sumit sibi honorem; Neither assumes any one honour to himself.* Neither could they have it from those, who consecrated them. For never a one of them had any themselves, as being either suffra-

gans



gans onely, or not designed to any See, or elected, and not invested. Neither was there then any Primate in *England* to give it them; neither had they it by generall consent of the Bishops of *England*; for they all resisted. Neither would they have it from the Pope, or Patriarch of *Constantinople*: neither would either of them give it them: much less had they it either from a generall Councell; for that was against them: nor from the generall consent of Catholique Bishops, either of the East or West Churches; for all opposed them. Neither did their fellow-superintendents beyond Sea, or could they confer jurisdiction upon them; for they were all as void of true jurisdiction, as these themselves were. Neither could they have it from the Queen or Parliament; for that had been a *heaping up of Masters to themselves*, 2 *Tim.* 4. 3. now cited. And Ecclesiasticall Jurisdiction being a Spirituall Government, is declared, 1 *Cor.* 12. 28. to be a supernaturall gift, and institution of God in his Church; and *ver. 6. prophesying*, that is the power of preaching, is declared to be a gift of the Holy Ghost; and therefore are above the

politique power of Magistrates of any Commonwealth: And *Acts 20. ver. 28.* The Holy Ghost is said to appoint Bishops to govern the Church of God; and so the giving jurisdiction to them must be supernaturall; coming from the Holy Ghost, and above the reach of politique governours. And if they must govern the Church of God, it belongs to them, as instruments of the holy Ghost, to appoint the particular Governours of it, And if Kings, Queens, or Parliaments, who are under the number of Scholars, and Subjects in the matter of Religion, could communicate Ecclesiasticall Jurisdiction to their Prelates, they would be governours of their governours, and masters of their masters, which is quite contrary to *Mat. 10. 24. Non est discipulus supra magistrum*; The disciple is not above his master; i.e. in those things wherein he is his master, which is here in Church-government. As therefore our Saviour *John 20.* and *Matth. 28.* sent his Apostles with power of governing and preaching, and the Apostles gave that Spirituall Jurisdiction to others, whom they sent to divers particular Provinces, and those Ecclesiasticall

astical persons onely amongst all Orthodox Christians, still communicated the like jurisdiction to others, both in the primitive, and after ages; and never did any Catholique Prince, or State, venture to confer jurisdiction upon their own Bishops, or Pastours; it is most manifest, that neither Queen *Elizabeth*, nor her Parliament had any such power: and consequently it follows from this enumeration of parts, that those *Elizabeth* Bishops and Pastours had no jurisdiction at all, nor any of their successours; and thereby, that all English Protestants attributing such jurisdiction to them, and adhering to them, as their lawfull Bishops and Pastours, are formal Schismaticques.

And here we impose a full period to this whole Conference, expecting no other fruit from it in the Readers, then a serious Attention in the perusal of it; an equall Judgement issuing from that Attention; a pious Will conform to that Judgement, and a wished Effect attending upon that Will; which is a speedy return into the bosome of the Catholique Church; from which they will see themselves stand separate by Schisme, and a

Conversation truly Christian upon that return; which continued till death, will carry them safely and powerfully on to an ever blessed Eternity.

---

**FINIS.**

---

# A brief Index of the principal matters.

## A.

- A**ctive separation necessary to Schisme  
page 2, 3. 15, 16.  
Authority Ecclesiasticall alwayes externall  
p. 193.  
The common Apprehension of prudent  
men acknowledged by them to be against  
them p. 255, 256.  
Misapplication of their own words p. 502,  
503.

## C.

### Contradictions.

- T**he first Contradiction in the first act  
of Diotrephes, cited p. 14.  
Acknowledged by them to be their reason  
p. 26.  
Denied to be theirs p. 50.  
Affirmed to be ours by them p. 83.  
Said by them to be an instance, that is, a  
Ff 5 reasons

## The Table.

- reason of Diotrephes his Schisme p. 86.  
 And yet said to be no reason p. 88.  
 Second Contradiction, they say they under-  
 stand bond and benefit in a conjun-  
 ctive sense onely p. 230.  
 And yet they put them in a disjunctive  
 sense p. 205.  
 The third Contradiction in the word all in  
 the instance of Firmilian. First it must  
 signifie absolutely all, to prove their Te-  
 net p. 415.  
 Secondly, they say it signifies not absolute-  
 ly all, but onely all, whom Stephen op-  
 posed by Excommunication p. 519, 520.  
 Thirdly, all signifies onely the lively mem-  
 bers of Christ, in their new acception of  
 the word Church 302, 303.  
 The fourth Contradiction, the word Church  
 signifies they say, not the visible Hie-  
 rarchicall Church p. 28.  
 And yet they say it signifies it, p. 6. to which  
 they relate p. 28.  
 This is declared p. 273.  
 The fifth Contradiction, they say, that Ec-  
 clesiasticall Communion may be either  
 internall or externall p. 497  
 And yet they say, Ecclesiasticall Commu-  
 nion, as used by the Fathers in relation

## The Table.

to Schisme, (and so it was onely used by Firmilian, whose words we there treated) is onely external p. 619.

The sixth Contradiction, separating another from the Church, for this sole reason, of keeping due Catholique Communion; and yet for other reasons beside this p. 125.

The seventh Contradiction, excluding suspension and interdict in their definition, p. 2. and including them in their formalis ratio p. 209.

The eight Contradiction, the lively members of Christ they abstract from the Hierarchieall visible Church, and yet call them the visible Church p. 302, 303.

The ninth Contradiction, they call the number of the lively members of Christ, the visible Church, (as contradistinguishing from the Politick Body) and yet say, that the Communion with them is internall p. 497.

The tenth Contradiction, they define the visible Church to be a society of Pastours rightly ordained, and their flocks adhering to them &c. p. 375. and yet say often in other places, that there is a visible Church distinct from this.

The eleventh Contradiction, they say the formalis



## The Table.

*formalis ratio of Schisme consists in the iolation of Communion, p. 619. and and yet they say, it consists in the violation of Communion, or of the priviledge and benefit of each Member, &c. in its being within that her externall Communion.*

P. 194

*The twelfth Contradiction. And p. 619 they say, that no act ought to be in the definition of Schisme, which is not a violation of Church Communion: and yet put Suspension and Interdict, in their formalis ratio, which are no violation of Church Communion*

P. 209

*The thirteenth Contradiction, in externall and internall Union,*

P. 625:

*Unjust Interdict, Suspens. &c.--no Schism, proved by examples in Antiquity. p. 207*

*Unlawfull and Schismaticall to communicate with Schismatiques,*

P. 208

## Miscitations.

*The first, of a Canon of the fourth Councell of Lateran*

P. 362.

*The second, of Nauclerus*

P. 354.

*The third, of Saint Augustins words p.*

493, 494:

The

## The Table.

*The fourth, of their own words* P. 57. 73.

*The fifth, of Firmilians words, putting;  
whilest thou thought to cut off all  
others, when it should be, whilest thou  
thought to be able to cut off all others*  
P. 415.

*The sixth, of our words, leaving out the  
word voluntary* P. 585.

## Misceoncepts.

*The first, of our words* P. 425.

*The second, in comparing Firmilian with St.  
Cyprian* P. 433.

*The third, affirming Firmilian to have been  
always a holy Bishop* P. 442.

*The fourth, of St. Cyprians words* P. 483.

*The fifth, that St. Cyprian was excommu-  
nicated by Stephen* P. 500.

*The sixth, in the meaning of those words,  
Episcopus Episcoporum, &c. to have  
been against Stephen* P. 520.

*The seventh, affirming Pope Stephen to  
have been a Schismaticque from* P. 567.  
*to* P. 580.

*Universall Custome alone sufficient to estab-  
lish Christians, in what they are to be-  
lieve and practise, from* P. 558. *to* P. 563.

Diotre-

## The Table.

### D.

**D**iotrephes his example proves not, for what it is alledged P. 2.  
Division onely negative, from the Church is shewed not to be Ichismaticall. p. 252.  
Needlesse Digressions from p. 377, to p. 388.

### E.

**V**Njust Excommunication, making no more a positive division from the Church, in opposition against it, then unjust banishment from the Commonwealth, from P. 235. to P. 342.  
No sole unjust Excommunication alledged by them to prove their definition, but alwayes joyned with some other formality, which makes it formally Schisme p. 298,  
299  
Ecclesiasticall Communion alwayes visible and externall P. 306. 408.  
These words, Episcopus Episcoporum, &c. not against Stephen the Pope, according to St. Augustin, p. 516. nor absolutely in themselves P. 424. 425.  
No

## The Table.

No unjust Excommunication of others, onely  
for keeping due Catholique Commu-  
nion, proved by them to be schismaticall,  
as it is an unjust Excommunication, or  
qua talis, from p. 592. to 595.

### F.

**F**athers cited for our definition, from p.  
156. to 168.

Firmilians instance enervated by them-  
selves p. 410. 411.

Firmilian in three states p. 416.

Firmilians testimony against Stephen dis-  
cussed, wherein he accounts not Stephen  
a Schismaticque for excommunicating  
others unjustly, but for condemning re-  
baptization of Heretiques p. 466. 472.

### G.

**S**T. Gregory cited to small purpose p.  
249.

### H.

**D**Octor Hammond defines Schisme  
with us. p. 8.  
He

## The Table.

*He sayes nothing against our definition p.*  
153.

*He makes Schisme to be a most horrid sinne*  
p. 211.

*Sr. Hierome defines Schisme with us p.*  
132.

*He supposes all Schisme to be a separation*  
*from the visible Church.* ibid.

*Hieremias Patriarch of Constantinople,*  
*granted by them to be a true part of the*  
*visible Church* 314, 315.

*He testifies, that the Greek Church opposeth*  
*the Lutherans in all matters of contro-*  
*versie appertaining to Faith betwixt us,*  
*save the supremacy* p. 315.

### I.

**T***Heir Instances from the purpose p.*  
108. p. 414. from Firmilian.

### L.

**T***He fourth Lateran Councels authority*  
*defended* from p. 323. to 365.  
*Vincentius Lirinensis his testimony of Ste-*  
*phen the Pope* p. 474.

*Five*

## The Table.

### N.

**F**ive Notanda to understand the Fathers  
concerning Schisme from p. 141. to  
150.

Novell opinions of our Adversaries p. 210.

### O.

**O**missions of our Arguments and An-  
swers p. 16. 21. 44. 71, 72. 93.  
119. 127. 206, 207. 213.

### P.

**P**roving what is not denied p. 120.  
Protestants cited for our definition.

from p. 183. to 188.

How St. Paul reprov'd St. Peter p. 537.

The Proof that Diotrephes was a Schis-  
matique, by an act, beside the active se-  
paration of himself, when even the last  
act of casting out the brethren, (which  
they alledged to prove it) being done be-  
cause they received St. John, included  
essentially a separation of himself p.  
22. the same is of casting others out,  
onely.

## The Table.

onely for keeping due Catholique Com-  
munion P. 93, &c.

R. H

**N**eedless Repetitions p. 194, 195:  
203, 222. and from 389, to 395.

Bishop of Rome affirmed to be a true Bi-  
shop, and part in, and of the visible  
Church, though they hold him a Schis-  
maticque p. 309.

The same they affirm of other Bishops in  
Communion with him p. 373.

The Bishop of Rome denying his Commu-  
nion to others, was esteemed anciently  
Excommunication, from P. 457. to  
461.

Stephen Bishop of Rome, extolled by Vin-  
centius Eirinensis, for a holy prudent Bi-  
shop, p. 474. praised by St. Augustin, p.  
475, freed by him from Schisme, ibid.  
justified by the Donatists, p. 476. celebra-  
ted as a Martyr, both in the West and  
Eastern Church p. 477. condemned by  
none, save by Firmilian, when he was in  
error, passion, and Excommunication,  
for a Schismaticque p. 466. 472.

Schisme.



## The Table.

### S.

#### Schisme.

- S**eparation of ones self from the whole  
visible Church, the onely formall noti-  
on of Schisme p. 190.  
Schisme in the Church (say they) as Sixo-  
sæta in the State p. 197.  
Schisme arent in the Church, according to  
them p. 197, 198. 201.  
Schisme a positive separation from the  
Church, and opposite against it p. 13.  
Stephen the Pope would have the ancient  
practice observed, whatsoever others ob-  
jected against it p. 552.  
This command of Stephen justified by Liri-  
nensis p. 474.

### T.

- M**istranslations p. 18.  
Whilest thou thoughtest to cut  
off others p. 28. which they translate  
rightly thus, whilest thou thoughtest to  
be able to cut off others p. 287  
Mistranslations of St. Augustins words  
p. 495.  
The

## The Table.

### ▼.

**T**He word voluntary hath two significations

p. 11.

Unjust suspensions, and interdicts, Schisms,  
according to them

p. 109.

Any Unjust act, done to others for keeping  
due Catholique Communion, will be  
Schisme, as much as unjust Excommu-  
nication, suspension, or interdict, inflicted  
for that sole cause

p. 99.

Visibility of the Church not hindered by  
holding the necessity of true intention to  
the validity of Sacraments

p. 380.

FINIS.

---

### Errata.

**P**Age 122. for read from. p. 137. for *ay* read *ux*  
p. 167. for *falso* r. *falsa*. p. 190. for *flow* a pro-  
priety, r. *flows as a propriety*. p. 251. let the Com-  
ma at Schisme, be put at it. p. 266. for *nonnullus*  
r. *nonnullas*. p. 312. *All heretiques* twice. p. 331.  
for *proves* r. *prove*. p. 334. for *singuli* r. *singulis*.  
p. 352. for *St. Antony* r. *St. Antonine*. p. 365. for  
*as they read as they can*. p. 406. line 4. for *suppose* r.  
*supple*.

---